

# CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

---

AMERICA FIRST PARTY  
Gerald L. K. Smith, Witness

## HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H. Res. 551

---

PART 6

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1944

---

Printed for the use of the Campaign Expenditures Committee



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1944

**CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE**

**CLINTON P. ANDERSON**, New Mexico, *Chairman*

**JOHN J. SPARKMAN**, Alabama

**CLARENCE J. BROWN**, Ohio

**JOHN W. MURPHY**, Pennsylvania

**AUGUST H. ANDRESEN**, Minnesota

**E. C. GATHINGS**, Arkansas

**RALPH E. CHURCH**, Illinois

**JOHN A. CADDELL**, Alabama, *Counsel*

# INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1944.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES,  
Washington, D. C.

The special committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Clinton P. Anderson (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

## REPORT OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL ASSOCIATIONS

At the time of the hearing at which the Communist Political Association was under subpoena and Mr. Earl Browder was testifying, Congressman Church requested a supplemental financial report, bringing the finances of the Communist Political Association down to August 31, 1944. He also requested that Mr. Browder furnish to the committee a list of the Indiana and Illinois State officers, both of the Communist Political Association and of the dissolved Communist Party. Mr. Browder has supplied to the committee as of this morning a financial report dated August 31, 1944, showing the income and expenses from the period of the last report filed with the Clerk of the House, to August 31, 1944, listing an income of \$42,206.24 during that period, and expenses of approximately the same amount. There is a balance of \$733.20.

Then there has been supplied to the committee a list of the State organizations of the Communist Political Association, showing officers for the States of Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, California, Arizona, New Jersey, Connecticut, Wisconsin, Colorado, Missouri, Montana, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Utah, Delaware, Maryland, and Washington. That list will be turned over to the secretary of the committee to be printed in connection with the testimony of the Communist Political Association as given by Mr. Browder, and the financial report will also be so printed.

At this time we will call Mr. Gerald L. K. Smith.

## TESTIMONY OF GERALD L. K. SMITH

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. State your full name and address, please.

Mr. SMITH. Gerald L. K. Smith, Detroit, Mich.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith, each person who has appeared before the committee has been given an opportunity, if he desired to do so,

to make a preliminary statement prior to examination by members of the committee. Do you desire at this time to make a preliminary statement?

Mr. SMITH. I do not think it is necessary, Mr. Chairman, except for one thing, Mr. Chairman. I would like to have it be a matter of record that I was not subpoenaed to this hearing. Due to the fact that organizations that oppose my activities had insisted so frequently, through the instrumentality of the press, that I be investigated; I felt that it was my duty to offer to appear before your committee; and on last Wednesday I telephoned you saying that I would be in the eastern part of the United States, and if I could contribute anything to facilitating your responsibilities as a committee, I would be happy to appear while in this area. The clerk of this committee wired me in care of the Statler Hotel at Cleveland, Ohio, suggesting that I appear today, at this time. I have responded and am ready to answer any questions that the committee has to put to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman is very willing to confirm that statement as to your telephone call. We did, of course, send to your office, as we sent to every organization that we felt was engaged in political activity, a request for information, which you had previously acknowledged.

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your title with the America First Party?

Mr. SMITH. I am the Presidential candidate of the newly formed America First Party. Prior to the convention which met in Detroit the 29th and 30th of August, I, together with two other individuals, accepted the responsibility of laying the groundwork for the formation of a legal party which came into existence as a State organization about the 1st of August and as a national organization about the 1st of September.

The CHAIRMAN. In the year of—

Mr. SMITH. 1944.

The CHAIRMAN. That organization was formed primarily through the sponsorship of a committee, was it not?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. It was a self-appointed committee which contacted people all over the United States apparently sympathetic to what we hoped to accomplish, looking toward the formation of a legal party in Michigan and a legal party all over the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. And the members of that committee, would you mind giving us their names, to the best of your recollection?

Mr. SMITH. Just three: Gerald L. K. Smith, Bernard A. Doman, and Don Lohbeck.

The CHAIRMAN. And they are residents of what State or States?

Mr. SMITH. Michigan and Missouri, respectively; Smith and Doman, Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. Back of all of this there has been your Committee of One Million?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; but that would not state the full facts.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you state it for us?

Mr. SMITH. The Committee of One Million was a corporation formed under the laws of the State of Delaware, for the purpose of educating people on the threat of subversive activities in America; communism, fascism, nazi-ism. That committee, however, has existed in name

only for the last 4 years. It has handled no funds as such. The fiscal agent of our activities in the State of Michigan educationally has been the Federation of Americanization of Michigan, Inc.

The CHAIRMAN: Then the Committee of One Million has not actually functioned?

Mr. SMITH. No. We have received no money in the name of that committee.

The CHAIRMAN. For 4 years?

Mr. SMITH. For approximately 4 years; in fact, a little more than 4 years.

The CHAIRMAN. During that time a monthly magazine entitled "The Cross and the Flag" has been published?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the sponsorship of what organization has it been published?

Mr. SMITH. It has been published by Gerald L. K. Smith.

The CHAIRMAN. Then it is in reality a personal—

Mr. SMITH. No; but the ownership of the magazine is held by the Federation of Americanization of Michigan, Inc.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been, however, the directing head and responsible agent for the publication?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. At all times?

Mr. SMITH. I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Has that magazine had an editorial policy or purpose?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. Its editorial policy and purpose has been in harmony with the principles of the Federation of Americanization; namely, to fight communism, nazi-ism, fascism, and to support traditional Americanism.

The CHAIRMAN. And all of the efforts of the magazine have been in that direction?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; they have.

The CHAIRMAN. In the first issue of your publication you had an editorial entitled "Sugar for Russia," with the opening sentence, "While we are being rationed on sugar, our sugar is being sent to Russia."

Would you indicate to the committee how that fitted in with the policy?

Mr. SMITH. Could you indicate, Mr. Anderson, where that appeared?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I shall be glad to find it for you, if you wish; it is on page 7, Sugar for Russia.

Mr. SMITH. It is not fundamental that I see the article, because I am only too happy to comment on that question, Mr. Anderson.

The CHAIRMAN. I realize that naturally you would want to see the full item.

Mr. SMITH. Because it fits right into my philosophy and the philosophy of our movement. It has been our theory, since the opening of the war, that the Communist Party, led by Earl Browder and others, and the left-wingers within the New Deal administration, were attempting to opportunize on our natural and justifiable patriotism in this war in order to make communism popular. We felt that it was enough to sell us on the idea of being loyal to our military allies as a practical military strategy, just as we were loyal in the last war to

Japan and Italy. That did not mean that we necessarily needed to embrace the political philosophy of our military allies. The moment the war broke out, the Communist Party organized a strategic movement all over the United States designed to embarrass nationalists and anti-Communists. Although they had been sabotaging our defense efforts when Hitler and Stalin were in bed together, the moment that Hitler invaded Russia they became the big "rah-rah" patriots and set out on a program to promote everybody into a concentration camp that had been effectively anti-Communist.

This editorial fits into our theory concerning that technique. We believe that anything that is said good about Russia in America should be as it pertains to the practical military strategy. But the effort to sell us on the political ideology of Russia is treasonable, un-American, and we think, as American citizens, we have a right to defend ourselves against this propaganda technique.

The CHAIRMAN. Following that, in the next issue of the magazine, we pass to an article on page 12: "Plenty of Rubber, says Expert," in which you say, "The Government's hysterical restrictions on tires were absurd."

Mr. SMITH. That was based on an interview I had with Mr. Sorenson, then the managing director of the Ford Motor Co. Before I inaugurated my campaign as a candidate for the United States Senate in 1942 on the Republican ticket, it was my personal viewpoint that the whole rubber program in America was a program of hysteria developed by the international rubber monopoly. But I went out to the Ford Motor Co. and called on Mr. Sorenson. He called in Mr. — the name slips me, just for a moment—but he is the chief rubber chemist and expert of the Ford Motor Co. Mr. Sorenson assured me that day that if he could get the o. k. from Mr. Leon Henderson, that they could supply replacement tires to every Ford worker within 30 days, every industrial worker within 3 months, and solve the problem within 6 months without the use of any critical war materials. I said, "When do you expect to hear from Mr. Henderson?" He said, "I expect to hear any time; he might call me this afternoon."

I said, "I don't think so. I think they are going to give this factory to Mr. Stalin."

"Well," he said, "of course, that is an extreme viewpoint."

A little later than that I conferred in the Detroit Club with Dr. Hale, the chief chemist of the Dow Chemical Co., who is also the brother-in-law of Dr. Dow. He told me of his experiences in Europe when he visited Poland and Germany in 1938, and said that he had been sent there by Dr. Dow to find out how to make rubber out of farm crops. He found 30,000 little processing plants making rubber out of farm crops in Poland, and 36,000 in Germany. He said to me, in effect, "Mr. Smith, the only mystery in the rubber program is the oil cartel." He said, "I had talked to the authorities in Germany and said that we would like to buy this formula." This was 1938. They said, "We cannot sell you the formula because it belongs to the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey." He returned to America and attempted to persuade the Standard Oil Co. to permit them to use it, because Dr. Dow had anticipated that in case of trouble in the South Seas we would be crippled for the lack of rubber and we must begin to make rubber out of farm crops. At that time we were burning up our wheat, plowing under our cotton, and destroying our farm products.

Based on what I learned from Dr. Dow in an afternoon's conference, and from the chief chemist of the Ford Motor Co., I went out then and reduced their scientific findings to popular appeal and told the farmers and the citizens of Michigan that every bushel of wheat had 8 pounds of rubber in it; and every bushel of potatoes. I said, "You are worrying about spare tires. They are in your corner, if we can take this thing out of the hands of the international rubber monopoly."

The day after I finished my campaign, the newspapers came out and announced that Mr. Ford's rubber tire factory, the most modern in the world, had been donated to Russia. They tore it down, shipped it to the west coast, put a red flag on the boats, and sent it to Russia, where they are now making rubber out of Japanese rubber which they seized from the Allies.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, subsequently, in the third issue of the Cross and the Flag—but let me revert again to the second issue. You have an editorial there, "My Hat's in the Ring," and you announce your candidacy and indicate that you would introduce a slogan, "Tires for everybody."

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. That was in furtherance of your program?

Mr. SMITH. I took the findings of the chemist, and the statement of Mr. Sorenson, and popularized it. Instead of saying 30 days, 90 days, or 6 months, I said, "Tires for the industrial workers by Christmas, and for everybody by Easter." Of course, when you make anything attractive, that is rabble-rousing; you understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, in the third issue of this same publication, you have an article entitled, "Cane Sugar and Political Gravy."

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In which you speak your mind on the subject of sugar rationing.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; well, I point out the tragedy—I do not see the article, but I remember what is there. I point out the tragedy of paying the big sugar cartels as high as \$600,000 a plantation for burning their sugar up on the eve of a war.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think I need to run through all of these articles, because the same philosophy runs through them. In the fourth issue you had another article entitled "An Open Letter to Leon Henderson," and "Will the Rationing of Gasoline and Tires Limit Church Attendance and Voting?"

On page 9 of the same issue you had an article, "A Crusader's Platform," dealing with several points. Point 3 was "Tires for everybody," in which this statement was made:

I promise that if elected to the United States Senate I will get tires for everybody, or they'll have to take me off the Senate floor on a stretcher, gagged, bound, and blindfolded.

Then in subsequent issues of the Cross and the Flag—

Mr. SMITH. You must understand, Mr. Chairman, while I was saying that Mr. Henderson was telling us that we were all going to have to ride bicycles during the war. And within 6 months it was demonstrated that if we could have taken rubber out of the hands of the oil cartel and put it in the hands of the farmers and start making it out of agricultural products, we could have had it, just as I said we could. First they said that we have got to ration tires to save

gasoline and then they said we have got to ration gasoline to save tires.

The CHAIRMAN. You will recall this March 1943 issue with the word "famine" across the front cover of it?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In which there was some comment on the possibility of America going hungry because of bureaucracy.

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. In the report of the national convention of the America First Party, which was held in Detroit, there is an article concerning famine.

Mr. SMITH. That is an address which I copied, that was delivered by Mr. Louis Bromfield in the Town Hall Meeting of the Air, over a radio network.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is one in which he predicted that we would have hunger and famine in America?

Mr. SMITH. I think the reason we did not have hunger and famine is because men like Bromfield and myself—I do not want to appropriate him to my movement; he does not agree with me on my political philosophy—but I think because there were some agitators like us, that we put an end to some of this foolishness that had been planned for us.

The CHAIRMAN. At the national convention of the America First Party at Detroit, February 7, 1943, in your report of that which you gave to your followers, you indicated that delegates paraded up and down the aisles under banners bearing the following slogans: "Butter for Americans First," "Meat for Americans First," in contradiction to the common phrase that we could not have both guns and butter.

Mr. SMITH. Well, just about that time, Mr. Anderson, the Russians had turned down two shiploads of oleomargarine and we had to replace them with butter. Our theory is, if anybody has to eat oleomargarine, let the Russians eat oleomargarine.

The CHAIRMAN. Your program was, then—was it or was it not?—directed against all types of rationing programs in the country?

Mr. SMITH. No. It was directed against any attempt to exploit the war for purposes of political regimentation, and the whole thing, we believed, struck at the very center of our American way of life, and was perfectly consistent with the principles of our committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Did it or did it not oppose the rationing programs, one by one, as they came along—sugar, tires, gasoline, butter—whatever they might be?

Mr. SMITH. No. It opposed the philosophy—it exposed the philosophy that had made it necessary, and it opposed certain techniques employed by the bureaucrats. And since we did not like the idea, our people did not like the idea of Mr. Hopkins and his wife having a 22-course dinner down here at the Carlton, five kinds of meat, and champagne of the vintage of 1926, at a cost of about \$5,000, for 40 people, just after Mr. Hopkins had written an article for the American Magazine telling us that we were all going to have to tighten our belts, and they were sending the miners into the mines with jelly rolls and peanut butter sandwiches—we did not like that. We were not opposed to the rationing program. We did not like the idea of Mr. Wickard having 500 pounds of butter in his freezer on his farm,



and 700 pounds of lard, just after Mr. Roosevelt and he had announced the rationing program, and that we would have to go without any.

The CHAIRMAN. The actual effect was opposition to each rationing program as it came along, was it not?

Mr. SMITH. The effect was that of any courageous expose of an un-American condition.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you feel that rationing constituted that?

Mr. SMITH. No. I felt that for the Secretary of Agriculture to hoard lard and butter just after he had asked everybody to tighten his belt, was un-American.

The CHAIRMAN. Passing from the rationing program to the field, perhaps, of international relations, what has been your attitude toward our Allies in the present war effort? Take all of our allies, Russia, England, China.

Mr. SMITH. I will take them in the order you have named them. Our attitude toward Russia has been that she was a military ally; that by act of Congress we had agreed to ally ourselves with Russia in order to win the war against Germany. And that alliance must be kept to the letter. But we must guard against any attempt on the part of the American Communist Party to opportunize on this alliance for the purpose of spreading Communism in America. I used the vernacular phrase in so many of my speeches: "We are going to win the war. There is only one way to end the war and that is to win it. But even though we are allied with Russia, we are not going to permit the wire-whiskered Reds of Detroit to bulldoze us."

That was our attitude. As to England, we felt that our military alliance with England must be kept faithfully, legally, and to the letter. But we do not like the idea of the British playing politics with Americans during a war. For instance, let me point out, in answer to your question about England, what we printed in the October issue of the Cross and the Flag, for 1943, I think it is, a very sensational statement which was made right here in Washington by a top-notch Britisher. It might have been 1942, October and November 1942. It was Sir Walter Venning's plan. This is an address that Sir Walter Venning made. He had been appointed by Mr. Churchill to execute the lend-lease program in Washington. He had just been here a week when he made this speech. He had a right to be here. He was here to execute the program which we had endorsed. Some of us had opposed it in advance, but when it was adopted by Congress, then it became a part of our military strategy and it was our duty to support it. He had a right to talk about anything involving guns and butter and lend-lease and getting the stuff over there to England and winning the war. But that is not what he talked about. Down in the fourth paragraph of that article—and I copied it exactly as it was sent out by the wire services—he said—and I am quoting Sir Walter Venning:

We have evolved a system [meaning the British] where no accounts are kept. There is to be no more of this wretched business of how many pounds we owe or how many dollars you owe us. I would like to see that same sort of union continued after the war. We might very well have a common currency and a combined Senate, sitting 1 year in London and the next year in Washington and another year in South Africa, and so forth. You could continue to have your President and we would continue to have our King.

As long as the British say things like that to us in war or peace, we are going to answer them. It is un-American. He has no business talking that way in our country.

The CHAIRMAN. Taking the very first issue of the Cross and the Flag, volume I, No. 1, on its cover you have an item which says, "Who Started the War? Churchill's Boast to the English becomes Confession to the World."

Mr. SMITH. In that editorial, Mr. Churchill said we went into the war—I will read it—

The CHAIRMAN. You have it on page 5, "England Puts England First."

Mr. SMITH. This is not the one I am referring to there. It is on page 3 of the first issue. The point is this: When Congress in conformity with the Constitution, as the people's representative, voted unanimously to declare war on Japan, Germany, and Italy, it was assumed Japan started the war. In fact, Japan did start the war; Congress was right. History will reveal that this was the official cause of the war—the attack by Japan on Pearl Harbor.

The CHAIRMAN. Go right on.

Mr. SMITH. But I am commenting on the quotation of Mr. Churchill up here, who said the involvement of America in this war "has been that for which I have aimed, worked, and dreamed." I just point out that while we did go into the war legally, for the very fundamental reason because we were attacked at Pearl Harbor, Mr. Churchill goes back and to maintain strength with his own Parliament bragged that, after all, it is one of his accomplishments.

The CHAIRMAN. On page 5, you have another item entitled "Blame Stalin," at the top of the page, the third paragraph: "No one has done more in this war to promote, facilitate, encourage, and extend the power of the Axis than Joseph Stalin."

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. At that time, Mr. Stalin was the only one, was he not, carrying on war against the Axis on European soil?

Mr. SMITH. The answer is "Yes." Immediately prior to the invasion of Russia by Hitler, it was Stalin who, in effect, said to Hitler, "Proceed, and you cannot expect any trouble from me." And with the assurance that Stalin would not interfere, Mr. Hitler took all of the Low Countries, France, and menaced England almost to the point of destruction. I think history will reveal Mr. Stalin's alliance with Hitler did more to strengthen Hitler's invasion of Europe and threatened invasion of England than any other one event in history.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he take that step prior to or subsequent to the so-called "sell-out of Munich?"

Mr. SMITH. Subsequent to the so-called "sell-out of Munich." England was at war with Germany. It took place after the Munich conference.

The CHAIRMAN. What I am getting at is that at that time, when Joseph Stalin was the only world leader who had his foot in the crack trying to hold back the Germans on the continent of Europe and while he was actually an ally of America and American soldiers, you accused him of expanding the power of the Axis.

Mr. SMITH. In that editorial, I accused him of having made the most fundamental contribution that the long viewpoint would reveal to the aggressive motives of Hitler in Germany. He could never have taken France without Stalin's consent; he could never have carried on the London blitz without Stalin's consent.

The CHAIRMAN. In the second issue, then, page 3, under the heading, "Christ First. Christ the Universal," at the end of the first paragraph, you say, "It is assumed that at least 5,000,000 men will be slaughtered between now and September 1 (1942), many of them Americans." Were you encouraging or discouraging the war effort in the country at that time?

Mr. SMITH. Well, that is a factual statement. That happened.

The CHAIRMAN. Five million men between May and September 1, 1942.

Mr. SMITH. If we can believe the Russian casualty reports.

The CHAIRMAN. Not in 1942, hardly, would it be? [No answer.]

In the November 1942 issue—do you have that in front of you there?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. At page 299, do you find an editorial entitled "Slackers in Washington," in which you advocate an examination of all draft deferments of governmental employees?

Mr. SMITH. I do not need to see that; I know what was meant by that. The press had revealed there were about half a million here of military age, many of them single, that had been deferred because they were working in Washington, at a time when they were taking three and four boys off of the farms in the Middle West.

The CHAIRMAN. Your statement there is: "It may be counted upon in advance that these deferments are almost 100 percent fraudulent." Would you care to comment on that?

Mr. SMITH. No; I will let the statement stand.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, among those "100 percent fraudulent" deferments were a group of boys that I took the liberty of defending on the floor not long ago—Department of the Interior employees on the pay roll, but that is because the Department of the Interior happens to have some mapping equipment that the War Department does not possess. An aviator flying over European territory in an American plane photographs the contours of the area into which General Eisenhower desires to march. That photograph is flown immediately back to Washington, goes into the plant of the Department of the Interior, is processed by these draft-deferred boys—college students, many of them; within 48 hours is made into a complete contour map and copies of it are made available to our military headquarters in France. Those are boys who might as well be working for the War Department as for the Interior Department. It only happens their equipment is in the Interior Building. Would you say those draft deferments were fraudulent?

Mr. SMITH. It was our opinion, Mr. Anderson, those boys should have been conscripted in the Army and fulfill such responsibilities as soldiers, sailors, or marines. It is my opinion that the contemporary agitation, such as appeared in this magazine together with other newspapers, brought about a reexamination of the draft status in Washington, and I think, since that time, the situation has been corrected. And I would be willing to say that the situation, as it existed then, in large measure does not exist now.

The CHAIRMAN. Then there was no possibility that there was any attempt to destroy faith in the Government at that time by saying that these men were being deferred fraudulently?

Mr. SMITH. I have never attempted to destroy faith in the Government, but I certainly do devote and, since the assassination of Huey

Long, I have certainly devoted a long time in trying to destroy faith in the New Deal program.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you feel that the drafting of men throughout the country has been a New Deal function, or has been a function of the draft boards, some of whom are members of the Republican Party?

Mr. SMITH. No. I never fixed the blame for the conscription program on the New Deal; I fixed the blame on the coalition school of internationalists. Even in 1940, when I opposed conscription and Mr. Willkie and Mr. Roosevelt both endorsed it, I opposed it by supporting the Canadian system. Canada does not have conscription; South Africa does not have conscription; New Zealand does not have conscription, neither does Australia. Still no one can question the heroic part these boys have played in the war.

And, in that connection, Mr. Anderson, may I ask for about 3 minutes of personal privilege?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH. I only have one son. His name is Gerald Smith, Jr. He had 6 years of military training. Because of the "disreputable"—put a single quote around that word "disreputable," please—background of his father, he was not qualified to enter the officers' training school, although most of his classmates became officers. He was 6 years in the oldest military academy in the South. He was transferred to the mule pack—the most menial military service in the Army. He volunteered for that responsibility with cheerful philosophy and was taken to Burma. The reason he went to Burma was because he volunteered—being notified in advance it would probably mean certain death.

He served with Merrill's Marauders. The outfit he served in had 300 men—200 killed. He was wounded. As a volunteer, he now bears the Silver Star, the Presidential Citation, the Combat Service Medal, or whatever they call it, and the Purple Heart.

I have made some 10 addresses, Mr. Anderson, in the last 12 days in great cities, and the press table—I have asked the newspapers if they would print that, and suppose I tell you that not one newspaper has ever carried that fact in it!

Now, may I say this, that there is no one over whom I have more influence than my own son. If I had developed a psychology of undermining the war effort, do you think my son would have volunteered for a certain death program? No. I schooled him in this philosophy and he embraced it: We must, when we declare war and embrace allies—we must keep the agreement to the limit. But that does not obligate us to help extend British imperialism or Russian communism.

Now, there are some newspapermen here. I wonder if they will print in the newspaper that my son has the Purple Heart, the Silver Star, the Combat Medal, served in Merrill's Marauders, one of four of the most heroic outfits in this war, according to the report, and is still in Burma; was wounded, and is in the hospital?

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Smith, in the August 1944 issue of the Cross and the Flag you recognize that there is a sedition trial going on in Washington and, on page 419, you have a heading concerning one of those defendants, "Elizabeth Dilling, the Frances Willard of nationalism." Would you care to comment on this in connection with the sedition trial, so that we may have the benefit of your viewpoint on that?

Mr. SMITH. Frances Willard was a Christian leader who suffered considerable persecution. A statue in her memory, I think, exists here in the Capitol Building some place.

Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling has produced some of the most valuable literature in America having to do with the subversive activity entitled "Red Network" and "Roosevelt's Red Record." She has spoken before numerous patriotic groups, literally hundreds of American Legion posts, Veterans of Foreign Wars posts, clubs, et cetera. She has perhaps been one of the most effective opponents of communism in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. She spoke with you in Ohio a few days ago, did she not?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; she spoke at St. Henry.

The CHAIRMAN. What date was that?

Mr. SMITH. A week ago Sunday afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. And in this editorial you expressed your opinion with reference to her, in which you say, "I defend Elizabeth Dilling."

Mr. SMITH. Yes; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you say, "Let our slogan be, 'We will not permit the bureaucrats, Communists and gestapo persecutors to imprison this Christian woman.'"

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I am willing to let that statement stand.

The CHAIRMAN. She is on trial before a legally established American court of justice, is she not?

Mr. SMITH. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. If that court ordered her imprisoned, what would your organization do about it, in view of this editorial?

Mr. SMITH. The editorial is written on the assumption, if she is given proper help with which to employ competent legal advice, that will be the only thing necessary to prevent her imprisonment—if she can be given the benefit of the ordinary processes of the law, which she has not been given. She should have been tried in Chicago, where she could have summoned witnesses and been tried in the presence of a jury composed of members of her own community, in the traditional American way.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I hope you will excuse me if you feel embarrassed for having been asked these preliminary questions. The committee naturally has read and heard a good deal about you, and likes to form its own impression about your philosophy. Now, I would like, if you do not mind, to move into the political aspect of the American First Party.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Anderson, in response and for the record, although it is not necessary in a personal way, but for the record, I would like to say that anyone who attempts to organize a minority party, in the face of the two great political parties, who is sensitive of attack toward himself, has chosen the wrong occupation for himself. And I assure you there is no complex in my appearance here and there is no question you can ask me which will embarrass me. If you ask me a question which I feel I have a constitutional right to refuse to answer, I will express my opinion in that matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Now, when was the American First Party organized?

Mr. SMITH. America First Party, as a crusading slogan, was used in 1944.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you not have an organization in 1943?

Mr. SMITH. Nothing except just a preliminary committee for the purpose of laying the foundation for the organization of a legal political party.

The CHAIRMAN. Did it have the same name then?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; it did.

The CHAIRMAN. And was the legal America First Party the legitimate child of that original committee?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Therefore there is a continuity between the America First Committee and the party which was organized?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. The America First Committee was a committee for which I personally assume full responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, should we not, for the record, differentiate between the America First Party and the group headed by General Wood?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. I think the way to differentiate it realistically would be to say the organization committee of the America First Party—that the America First Party was the consummation of the America First Organization Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. What I am thinking of is the fact that there was, in 1939 and 1940, an America First group that was quite active.

Mr. SMITH. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no connection—

Mr. SMITH. There is no connection. I thought you meant between our own preliminary group and the legal party formed in Detroit.

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. SMITH. No; there is no connection legally, organizationally, or personally between General Wood's organization and mine.

The CHAIRMAN. You did inherit their mailing list, however, did you not?

Mr. SMITH. I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not?

Mr. SMITH. I did not; no. I did not need any mailing lists; I had plenty of my own.

The CHAIRMAN. It is simply that I understood those lists were furnished to you.

Mr. SMITH. They were not. There was one local committee that gave me 6,000 names.

The CHAIRMAN. That committee was in Chicago?

Mr. SMITH. No; St. Louis.

The CHAIRMAN. In St. Louis?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it goes to show that some information we get is distorted, as at least I have found.

Mr. SMITH. I have been trying to get those lists. I would like to have them, although I do not think they would be much good.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, in 1944, you actually formed a political party known as the America First Party?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; about the 1st of August we formed the Michigan party, and about the 1st of September the national party—those were the two first legal conventions.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, in August 1944, on the dates of the 29th and 30th, you had a convention in Detroit?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. At the Detroit-Leland Hotel?

Mr. SMITH. Correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And you had delegates there from how many States?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, 26, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you describe for us some of the physical surroundings of the convention? By that, I mean we all know what the major parties had in Chicago, at the Stadium. What did you do; did you have a place for delegates to register; did you have badges; did you have literature that you distributed, and items of that nature?

Mr. SMITH. The answer to all those questions is "Yes."

The CHAIRMAN. You required each delegate, then, to sign a registration blank when they entered?

Mr. SMITH. That is correct; not only to sign the blank, but to commit himself to the formation of a new party.

The CHAIRMAN. You committed them to the formation of a new party?

Mr. SMITH. I signed one of the blanks myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, as these people walked along, they were handed pieces of literature, or were given an opportunity to pick up pieces of literature?

Mr. SMITH. No; we had no literature that was given to the delegates, politically.

The CHAIRMAN. But it was there on the platform?

Mr. SMITH. If you will let me see that, I will look at the literature and state.

The CHAIRMAN. That is some of the literature, is it not? That is a booklet entitled "Famine in America," by Joseph P. Kamp.

Mr. SMITH. No; that was not given out at our convention. I will tell you why—because the man who wrote this book is for Dewey.

The CHAIRMAN. Joseph P. Kamp is for Dewey?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Can we put that down in the record firmly and irrevocably?

Mr. SMITH. No: I do not have to speak for Mr. Kamp, but I think personally he favors Dewey.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, if it should develop that there were people there who saw a stack of booklets entitled "Famine in America," by Joseph P. Kamp, and took copies of them—if, for example, this group [exhibiting] came from your convention—would you still say "Famine in America" was not distributed?

Mr. SMITH. No; because the gestapo snoopers harass me all the time. They specialize in trying to produce the kind of evidence somebody would like to present here.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you recognize this little ticket entitled "Good for One Admission. Curbstone Theatre. Super double-extra colossal softie extravaganza. No cost has been spared, the gentiles pay plenty. Nathan Grossman starring in The Black Market. Supporting Cast of 500,000 Kikes. Continuous Spectacle. "Watch the kikes jip the New Deal." Was that circulated there?

Mr. SMITH. I have never seen it before. It is no part of the official literature. In fact, I saw many of your Democratic friends in Chi-

cago, Mr. Anderson; I saw all kinds of literature written about each other.

The CHAIRMAN. So did I. Now, there were on that table all the publications of the American Democratic National Committee, were there not?

Mr. SMITH. Let me see that. [After a pause]: No; those were no part of our system at all.

The CHAIRMAN. But they are like some people that we had at the Republican and Democratic conventions; they were all there, were they not, these publications, on the table?

Mr. SMITH. Not as far as my knowledge is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you were the boss of that convention?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, I would not say that.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you were the guiding genius at that convention?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I said to the delegates: "We have been accused by the press of having a one-man Mackinac here. I assure you I am not going to be teased by our enemies into permitting a well-organized group of political slickers to come in here and run away with our party. It is a new party, just like a little child starting to walk from one party to another, and, if I see it slipping, I am going to reach out my hand."

In connection with that strategy, I said—and it is a matter of record—"We want it thoroughly understood that no literature distributed near or in this convention has the endorsement of this convention unless it is reviewed or referred to from the platform."

The CHAIRMAN. But there was a large table just inside the door, on which this literature was displayed, was there not—or on which literature was displayed; let us put it that way?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; literature was displayed.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, those pieces, if they were there, would have been part of that exhibit, would they not?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; unless some New Dealer just came in and threw down a bundle and ran out, so you would have them here.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think, when this happened, that anyone had an idea we were going to be here. What I am driving at is, if there were on that table the basic publications of the American Democratic National Committee, then I take it that it was without your approval?

Mr. SMITH. It was without our knowledge and approval.

The CHAIRMAN. But you would not be in a position categorically to deny there might have been those publications there on the table, would you?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I do not know. We were pretty particular about that table. We would not have—in fact, I think, if necessary, I could put an individual under oath right here, who presided at the table there, who would assert there was nothing on that table except that which was officially endorsed by us.

The CHAIRMAN. And if I could put under oath three or four people at the convention who saw this literature, then we would have a conflict in the testimony?

Mr. SMITH. That is right. Just let it stand; it does not make much difference to me anyway.



The CHAIRMAN. I think that is entirely correct; it doesn't matter to me either.

Was there at that table a pamphlet entitled, "Must the Killing Go On?" a peace catechism by Dorothy Hutchinson, published by the Peace Now Movement?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. That would not be there, either?

Mr. SMITH. No. Not only that, but we have officially disapproved the Peace Now Movement, as such. There have been myriads of Gestapo agents, self-appointed, for harassing groups.

The CHAIRMAN. Were any newspapermen permitted inside your convention?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, yes. We had a press table.

The CHAIRMAN. Would they not be in a position to know whether there was or was not literature on that table?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; they would be in a position to know.

The CHAIRMAN. Therefore it might not have come from harassing groups; is that not correct?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I have met some newspapermen in my lifetime who belonged in those harassing groups.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you recall whether or not there was this publication by Mr. Biggers—his reply to Congressman Fulmer? Was that there [exhibiting]?

Mr. SMITH. I see those everywhere and I would not be able to give you a straight answer to that. I see them everywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, "A Plan for World Peace and a Home Land for the Jews." Was that part of the official proceedings?

Mr. SMITH. No. On the contrary, we oppose home land, for which we are called anti-Semitic, and, if we support it, we are called anti-Semitic.

The CHAIRMAN. Leland L. Marion was there?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he have a card that he circulated there?

Mr. SMITH. He did.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that card read, "George Washington was the first head of the America First Party"?

Mr. SMITH. It does.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he?

Mr. SMITH. I would make a little academic correction there.

The CHAIRMAN. You could not trace a direct lineal descent?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I can trace a lineal descent to our ancestors in that statement. In a recent meeting, I said I was sued for \$100,000 by some fellow from New York for using the term "America First." I said he sued the wrong man; he should either have sued George Washington or General Hodges, leading the American First Army in France.

The CHAIRMAN. Did George Washington use the term "America First"?

Mr. SMITH. No; but I know that, concerning him, it was said he was "first in peace, first in war, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

The CHAIRMAN. That put him into the fold of the party, then?

Mr. SMITH. It suits me. His face is the vignette on the party.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, at that place did they circulate a pamphlet by the Committee for Constitutional Government entitled "What American Democracy Means to Me"? Was that lying on your table?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You had no publications of that committee at the America First convention lying on the table?

Mr. SMITH. For the record, I would like to say this, in case some overzealous Government agent would want to indict me for libel, or for perjury, if I gave you a straight answer: I will say to the best of my knowledge, in reference to all of my answers relative to this literature table.

The CHAIRMAN. That is perfectly proper.

Mr. SMITH. There is a good card [exhibiting]. I wish you would read that to the committee [handing to chairman].

The CHAIRMAN (reading):

G. O. P. (Grand Old Party). Born July 6, 1854. Died June 28, 1944.

This notice of bereavement concerns the passing into eternity of the Republican Party. Its untimely end took place on June 28, 1944, in the stadium situated in the city of Chicago.

For a long time prior to this date it had been afflicted with creeping New Dealism, which characteristically destroys the functioning of the brain, and always proves fatal. (This is the same malady which some years back caused the death of the Democratic Party.)

In this hour of deep mourning we must give thought to the future. It is necessary that there be born a new political party to represent primarily our own national interests—one that will love, cherish, and protect the Constitution—one to which constitutional Americans can devote their labors and look upon with complete confidence.

That deals with the demise of the Republican Party, which you are now supporting?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. I would be very happy to have from you a statement now as to what that situation is or was.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I read it in the newspapers the very day you had volunteered to come down here.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I wondered if the newspaper announcement you had decided at that late date to support Governor Dewey, who has not, well, been overly complimentary in his comments to you, had any connection with the decision. Would you care to comment on that?

Mr. SMITH. I would be only too happy to comment on that.

There are certain States where it is impossible for us to get on the ballot, where it is impossible for us to write in the name of a candidate; there are two counties in Ohio with a committee, and in New York State a county, where the method of voting exists, where that situation exists, due to voting machines and otherwise, that our people vote the Republican ticket, and we may have nationalists who are Democrats, and in case of nationalist Democrats may vote against an internationalist Republican, but if Senator Ball were running against Senator Wheeler we would support Wheeler against Ball.

The CHAIRMAN. As you supported Senator Clark against McKittrick, in Missouri, to take a concrete example?

Mr. SMITH. We did not support Senator Clark officially, but our people were temperamentally for Clark.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask how you distinguish between "officially" and "temperamentally"?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; it is very easy to answer that question. Official support is to raise money, go down and spend it, and temperamental support is to just let nature take its course.

The CHAIRMAN. We have a good many definitions of "support."

Mr. SMITH. That is as good a one as you will get.

The CHAIRMAN. "Official support" means that you support with money?

Mr. SMITH. That you get out and endorse a candidate, raise money for his support, help elect him. You have found several other definitions but you have never found a good one.

The CHAIRMAN. It would not be a profitable venture for me to go all through this material to see if you might recognize or might not recognize it, but may I ask you just one or two other questions. Do you recognize this paper entitled "Will There Be Jobs for Veterans, Not on the World Police Force, if They Return Home?"

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not recognize that.

The CHAIRMAN. In which it is indicated that some 15,000,000 people are taking our boys' places and "Are our boys fighting to have their places taken by these"?

Mr. SMITH. No. However, I would like to say that we oppose the immigration of refugees into the United States because we believe those refugees would take jobs that belong to the soldiers. We believe immigration should be stopped; I am 100 percent for that.

The CHAIRMAN. There were many editorials from the New York Journal concerning Communists. Do you recognize this one as being against Congressmen as being part of the literature that was laid on the table?

Mr. SMITH. The one of Morrison is against Communists, not against Congressmen, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Did I say Congressmen?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it is sometimes directed against Congressmen also, but I appreciate the correction.

Mr. SMITH. Yes. I know that there were a lot written by Mrs. Morrison and I think she has done a pretty good work, and if she had been at the convention and said "Might we distribute literature," I probably would have said "yes."

The CHAIRMAN. There are some other things that I have here: I shall pick up this one and ask you if you recognize that [indicating].

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is one of the things?

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That is official?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I was trying to see if there was any likelihood that in picking up this our people also got something official.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That was real?

Mr. SMITH. That is real.

The CHAIRMAN. There were several others supplied; I will ask you if you recognize this as being on that table [indicating].

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. All of them were gathered at the same time and at the same place, and I am glad to know that you recognize that one.

Mr. SMITH. You mean the report that you have?

The CHAIRMAN. The report that I have.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, certainly.

Mr. GATHINGS. If there is any other literature that was official that did not happen to be among your collection, if he would like to say—

The CHAIRMAN. I was going to come to that; that is a good question, but I was trying to find out what was on the table. Of course, the literature was displayed and most of it that I have shown, you say was not on that table.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you state affirmatively what was on that table, the literature?

Mr. SMITH. I will tell you what, Congressman: My wife is here and if she will be kind enough to refresh my memory and write down that list I will read it to you later.

The CHAIRMAN. May we have that?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. Why not have her give them to the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. SMITH. She is Mrs. Smith, and she will remember what was on the table; there were two or three different things.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the pamphlet entitled "Forty Years of Roosevelts"; are you familiar with that pamphlet?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Would it help to refresh your recollection that in June 1944 you sent out a letter referring to the announcement that James Roosevelt would run for President in 1948 and calling attention to this pamphlet Forty Years of Roosevelts?

Mr. SMITH. Well, you are substantially correct, Mr. Chairman, but I want to say by way of interpolation, because it might create a misunderstanding—

The CHAIRMAN. For the purpose of the record, the pamphlet Forty Years of Roosevelts starts out—

Mr. SMITH (interposing). I was agreeing with you that a committee had been formed in New York City, according to a press dispatch, which committee had for its purpose the booming of James Roosevelt in 1948; that was a little later, and that referred to a very good booklet, Forty Years of Roosevelts.

The CHAIRMAN. The fact remains that Roosevelt did not become President until 1933.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. It starts off with Teddy Roosevelt.

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And by adding Teddy Roosevelt to the four or five terms of Franklin D. Roosevelt, plus James Roosevelt, that would make it 40 years?

Mr. SMITH. Of course, we insist there has been a more or less unbroken policy in some respects beginning with Teddy Roosevelt. We consider Teddy Roosevelt responsible for Wilson's administration because he split the Republicans that year that gave us Mr. Wilson and that same crowd has been in more or less ever since.

Mr. ANDERSON. Do you regard Mr. Harding as a part of the Roosevelt clan?

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not believe so.

Mr. ANDERSON. How about Cal Coolidge?

Mr. SMITH. No. You are oversimplifying this thing, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON. Sometimes oversimplification is necessary to get it over to Congressmen.

Mr. SMITH. If you will read the book, you will see——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I have, and I see very little in it that strikes my particular fancy. This was circulated at the convention?

Mr. SMITH. I could not say; but if someone said that it was, I would not make a desperate attempt to deny it.

The CHAIRMAN. You have given it as a premium, more or less, for subscription; if someone sent in six subscriptions, you sent them a copy of *Forty Years of Roosevelt*?

Mr. SMITH. I do not think that is quite correct.

The CHAIRMAN. May I read—I was in error—for every 6-months subscription there was given a copy of *Forty Years of Roosevelt*. For every \$2 you sent them, two copies.

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And for \$10 you would send them 20 copies?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you do if someone gave you \$5,000?

Mr. SMITH. I would send them 5,000 copies, after—just right after the smelling salts.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, to keep on with this convention for just a moment. I am anxious to get the physical facts surrounding that convention very firmly before us. Did you have any guards or sergeants at arms at the convention?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have six?

Mr. SMITH. Well, we always have had hundreds.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Everybody attending my meetings are sergeants at arms.

The CHAIRMAN. But you have some who were a little more sergeantry than others?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; we had two men appointed to carry out anybody that was obnoxious.

The CHAIRMAN. Who were those two men?

Mr. SMITH. I am trying to think of the man's name from St Louis—George Gebhardt.

The CHAIRMAN. And the other one?

Mr. SMITH. Wallace Gamber.

The CHAIRMAN. I am glad to have those names, but just frankly I was thinking of some other name, and I want you to tell me the name of the man who was the sergeant in charge of the guards at the convention.

Mr. SMITH. There was no such man there.

The CHAIRMAN. There was no such chief sergeant at all?

Mr. SMITH. There was no one that was given such an appointment.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there anybody that came and got you and took you to the convention and took you home at night?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it Clyde Morrow?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. It was not Clyde Morrow?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Was Clyde Morrow at the convention?

Mr. SMITH. He was not at the convention—

The CHAIRMAN. He was not? Remember, you are under oath.

Mr. SMITH. Wait just a minute and I will tell you.

The CHAIRMAN. But be very careful.

Mr. SMITH. I am not unmindful of that. I merely want to say that Clyde Morrow was not at the State convention. He was unable to attend the State convention; he attended the National convention. That was the reason I said "No." I have no desire to quibble on that. Clyde Morrow was at the convention.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; and I was in position to know that he was at the convention, and I knew if you would look it up, you would find he was at the convention.

Mr. SMITH. I said he was at the convention, but not at the State convention.

The CHAIRMAN. We are interested in the national convention.

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Clyde Morrow reside at 10444 Greenbriar?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he serve as a sergeant at arms of the convention?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know if the license number of his car was CM1291, Michigan?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. If it should develop that CM1291 is the license number of Clyde Morrow's automobile, and if regularly appointed agents of the United States Government had seen CM1291 on a car with Clyde Morrow pick you up at the convention and drive you home again on two occasions, would you still feel you had never ridden in Clyde Morrow's car?

Mr. SMITH. I believe, Mr. Anderson, I am convinced that I did not ride in Clyde Morrow's car at any time during that convention, and frankly, I want to add to that, Mr. Anderson, had he pulled up in front of the hotel and asked, "Are you going to the convention, Mr. Smith," I would have said, "Thank you, I am glad to get the ride."

The CHAIRMAN. You know that this Morrow was an accredited delegate to the convention but you do not recall that he was the chief sergeant at arms or guard, and you would not undertake to say he was not?

Mr. SMITH. I am confident, and I will rest my whole reputation on my oath on that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. And there were at least five men who came with you and acted as guards?

Mr. SMITH. Positively not.

The CHAIRMAN. But your understanding is that Clyde Morrow is employed in Detroit?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; a plant-protection man at the Highland plant of the Ford Motor Co.

The CHAIRMAN. He is the chief guard at the Ford Motor Co.?

Mr. SMITH. He was a guard, did day work and night work.

The CHAIRMAN. There have been a lot of people working nights, trying to get some information, and I am glad to know that there are others who are doing the same.

This Mr. Morrow is employed at the Ford plant?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And he was a delegate to the convention?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. How about Harry K. Jung?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any relations with him?

Mr. SMITH. No; but I know who Harry K. Jung was.

The CHAIRMAN. His post-office box was 144 in Chicago, was it not?

Mr. SMITH. He has an office in the Tribune Tower and is considered one of the most intelligent research men on the subject of communism in America.

The CHAIRMAN. And he has a whole floor in the Tribune Tower Building, has he not?

Mr. SMITH. I could not answer that; I have only been in the office once.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he pay any rent for that floor?

Mr. SMITH. I have no knowledge on that, Mr. Anderson.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he do what might be called labor espionage?

Mr. SMITH. I have no knowledge of that.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not?

Mr. SMITH. That is the first I have ever heard of that.

The CHAIRMAN. What about Maertz? Was he present as a delegate?

Mr. SMITH. He was.

The CHAIRMAN. At whose invitation?

Mr. SMITH. At the invitation of a Chicago citizen who was connected with the America First Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Could that have been Harry Jung?

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not think so. It seems rather fantastic that it would have been.

The CHAIRMAN. He was there anyhow as an accredited delegate from Illinois?

Mr. SMITH. He was there; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he stand up and offer a resolution?

Mr. SMITH. He did.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you mind disclosing what the resolution provided for; did it provide for the removal of all Jews from the United States within 5 years, or their sterilization if they did not move within that time?

Mr. SMITH. I think it did. I have here a copy of the platform that was adopted and you will observe—there were many copies—you will observe there were 40 subjects discussed, and among the subjects that were discussed, just as it was discussed at the Democratic convention and the Republican convention, was the Jewish situation. When the subject of Jewish persecution and the problem of the Jews arose every delegate in the convention was assured as he was on other subjects, that he could present any statement he desired. Mr. Maertz whom I have never seen before—his name is not on our files—arose on

the floor of the convention and offered a resolution that all Jews be deported and those that would not submit to deportation submit to sterilization.

The CHAIRMAN. How was that resolution received by the convention?

Mr. SMITH. I will tell you, Mr. Anderson: Every person who commented on the subject opposed Mr. Maertz' position. It received no second—it was not even received by the convention; and I arose on the floor and said that I had been raised in a Christian home where I had been taught it was wrong to hate any man because of race, creed, or color, and that this problem could not be solved other than in the spirit of the Man of Galilee. That portion of the statement appeared in the Daily Press.

Mr. MURPHY. May I ask a question there, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Were the proceedings of the convention recorded?

The CHAIRMAN. I have not been informed, but I would be glad to know.

Mr. MURPHY. Were the proceedings reported?

Mr. SMITH. How is that?

Mr. MURPHY. Were the proceedings reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Reported verbatim by some outside agency so that the proceedings of the meeting might be available?

Mr. SMITH. We had—we did not have neutral reporters.

Mr. MURPHY. Was any report, stenographic report, made?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; we had them.

Mr. MURPHY. Is that report available?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; it is.

Mr. MURPHY. Where?

Mr. SMITH. In Detroit.

Mr. MURPHY. At what office?

Mr. SMITH. At the headquarters of the America First Party.

Mr. MURPHY. Will you produce them?

Mr. SMITH. I will produce them provided I would not have to swear under oath that they are absolutely correct, because we did not have the competent reporters, I will say.

The CHAIRMAN. If we may have them we will accept them with that understanding.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That to the best of your knowledge they are a correct statement of what took place.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith, some of the newspapermen who were present at the convention seemed to feel that the resolution passed.

Mr. SMITH. I am perfectly willing to have that question settled by the Detroit News, one of the largest newspapers which was there, represented by Mr. Hoover, a reporter.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Detroit Free Press?

Mr. SMITH. And the Detroit Free Press. Both papers were opposed to the America First Party and if they say that the resolution was passed then I will stick to my word.

The CHAIRMAN. Just what did they say?

Mr. SMITH. They quoted me.

The CHAIRMAN. That it did not pass?



Mr. SMITH. That it not only did not pass; it was rejected; it was rejected and not even received.

Mr. MURPHY. May I ask a question there.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Mr. Murphy.

Mr. MURPHY. Who was the Chicago citizen who invited that gentleman who offered that resolution?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. You had never seen this gentleman before this; this Homer Maertz?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. He was a member of the Silver Shirts?

Mr. SMITH. I have no knowledge of the background of Mr. Maertz.

The CHAIRMAN. For your information, I can say that he was arrested once or twice in Chicago for breaking windows in stores of wealthy Jewish merchants and admitted that he was a member and leader of the Silver Shirts in Chicago; and I just wanted to establish the fact that he was a recognized delegate and one of the people who had been active in the German-American Bund; that was one of the things that I wanted.

How about Carl Mote—was he at the convention?

Mr. SMITH. He was chairman of the convention.

The CHAIRMAN. He was chairman?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know him well?

Mr. SMITH. Quite well.

The CHAIRMAN. You have known him for a good many years?

Mr. SMITH. Three years.

The CHAIRMAN. His name is Carl H. Mote?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. He is a well-to-do gentleman, is he not, general manager of the Northern Indiana Telephone Co.?

Mr. SMITH. He is a fine, progressive businessman, independent businessman; I do not know that he is quite wealthy.

The CHAIRMAN. He is moderately well to do?

Mr. SMITH. I would say that he was just comfortably independent.

The CHAIRMAN. He is also head of the Commonwealth Telephone Co.?

Mr. SMITH. I think so—that is, some little telephone company.

The CHAIRMAN. He also is listed as one of the delegates?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And he was chairman of the convention August 29 and 30, 1944?

Mr. SMITH. That is correct. That appeared on the back of the platform.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. He was also candidate for Republican nomination for the United States Senate in Indiana?

Mr. SMITH. Correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And he—was he in this election, in the primary election?

Mr. SMITH. There is no primary in Indiana; he had to be nominated by the party convention, of the Republican Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Smith, for the purpose of the record I want to show you a statement—first I want to ask you if you will recognize the name, or the signature of Mr. Mote?

Mr. SMITH. I would not want to say I would, Mr. Anderson, until I had seen it. I would under ordinary circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. This would be under very ordinary circumstances. Mr. SMITH. But I have seen so much evidence prepared by others—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Do you know his handwriting, could you recognize it?

Mr. SMITH. First I would rather see what the letter says and then I could tell you.

The CHAIRMAN. You want to know what is in the letter first?

Mr. SMITH. No; frankly, Mr. Anderson, I have no wish to be facetious at all.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. This letter is addressed to Hon. Edward James Smythe, one of the defendants in the sedition case—the only defendant, I think, the Government had to hunt down—and that is signed by a signature that I was in hope you might identify. The letter reads:

DEAR MR. SMYTHE: I have no objections whatever to your reprinting all or any part of the pamphlet. Naturally, I will expect you to adhere to the literal text.

I am glad you like the pamphlet. I wish I had more confidence that anything will function at this late hour. Frankly, I haven't much faith left. I mean faith in the power of the truth. My opinion is that the masses are unwilling to accept for contemplation anything unpleasant, including the truth.

On Wednesday night, I spoke in the courthouse at Liberty to a courtroom filled with farmers. I stressed the revolutionary character of the origins and philosophy of the A. A. A. and New Deal. I read to them the Bolshevik decree by which all land in Soviet Russia was confiscated. I doubt if a single farmer was convinced that there is much danger of any such decree being imposed in America. It was unpleasant to think about and, therefore, dismissed quickly as something very remote, very remote, even fantastic; it can't happen here, etc., when, the truth is, the skids already are greased. What apathy. What inaction. What stupidity.

Good luck to you, sir.

Sincerely,

CARL H. MOTE.

Then Mr. Mote on the side of the letter says what is purported to be in his own handwriting, a statement concerning Cherep-Spiridovich:

What do you know about Cherep-Spiridovich, who is now with Pelley? He weighs about 200, a little over 6 feet, blue eyes and fair, aged perhaps 40.

What is of interest is the fact that the letter brings together three people who have all been identified with the German-American Bund activities in this county. Mr. Pelley's name you recognize as the head of the Silver Shirts.

Mr. SMITH. Before I answer that, Mr. Chairman, may I say that evidently the script in the letter is in his handwriting; that letter sounds good to me and I have no desire—it sounds like a letter that Carl Mote would have written, and I presume that is his signature. Now as to marginal reference I cannot say as to that. What was the date of that letter?

The CHAIRMAN. May 1, 1942. What I am trying to establish is the fact that in this one letter Mr. Mote brings together Edward James Smythe, who is leader of the War Veterans' Association, and is named as a defendant in this sedition trial; he brings in this letter an individual named Cherep-Spiridovich, who is also a defendant in the sedition trials, and who worked with William Dudley Pelley who has

been well recognized for his activities. Pelley has been sent to prison for being a leader of German activities and an agent of the German Government while head of the Silver Shirts. I wondered if you cared to comment or have anything further to say concerning Mr. Mote, who was chairman of your meeting, concerning that triple alliance?

Mr. SMITH. I would not want to call it a triple alliance, Mr. Chairman. I would say that evidently Mr. Mote has corresponded with numerous nationalists but that he cannot underwrite the conduct of nationalists. By the same syllogism, or by the same argument of association, I can say that Mr. Hillman is supporting Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Browder is supporting Mr. Roosevelt, and therefore what is Mr. Roosevelt?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Mr. Murphy.

Mr. MURPHY. Do you consider equally absurd the first part of the association as you do the second instance?

Mr. SMITH. I am saying that there is nothing in that letter that would affect my high estimate of the patriotism and Americanism of Carl H. Mote.

Mr. MURPHY. My question is, do you consider the second association as absurd as you do the first instance?

Mr. SMITH. When you say the second instance, you refer to Mote?

Mr. MURPHY. You referred to Browder and Hillman and the President of the United States, and secondly—

Mr. SMITH. I think that the association of these three latter is more applicable than the association of the others.

Mr. MURPHY. More absurd in the first instance than it is in the second instance?

Mr. SMITH. I refuse to introduce the word "absurd."

Mr. MURPHY. You agree that the association necessarily forces and constitutes a tie-up in the first instance but it does not in the second?

Mr. SMITH. I think there is more intimacy between the latter instance than this former one.

Mr. MURPHY. Well, I will come to that later.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Since we are on the convention discussion I think I will submit for the record at this point the resolution that Mr. Maerz offered. Would you care to identify that as a correct quotation of the resolution?

Mr. SMITH. No; I would not want to do that without my records, but I will do this: I have no objection to the Maerz resolution going in provided as a part of the record it is shown that the resolution was not received; several spoke orally against it, that it was opposed and that I at the close of the discussion openly opposed it.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I will leave it out of the record.

Mr. SMITH. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you at any time or subsequently at any stage of the game bring up the fact that Maerz had been a leader of the Chicago unit of the Nazi-American Bund?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. He was accepted and received as a delegate. Was there any effort to keep from the convention those people who had been Silver Shirts or members of the German-American Bund, and whose activities for a long period of time had been well recognized?

Mr. SMITH. Each application blank carries with it a place for a list of organizations and former associations. When the applications were filed there were some six that were not seated and they were referred to the committee on credentials and one of those which appeared was the application of Mr. Maerz. However, we had thrown out a couple of people—

The CHAIRMAN. You had thrown out a couple of people for what purpose?

Mr. SMITH. One because of his operational work for the gestapo organization, and the other because of his highly anti-Semitic work, known as a non-Sectarian anti-Nazi organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was that?

Mr. SMITH. One man was of Italian descent; he had several names. Rossi or Buzzi. And may I say in this connection, Mr. Chairman—may I, as an American citizen, offer you a petition; as a committee of the Congress I offer you this petition: Inasmuch as this organization, the non-Sectarian anti-Nazi league is spending evidently thousands of dollars to fight me and my activities for work among our people, may I petition you to call the officers of this organization to question them before this committee, because if they are fighting a candidate they are in politics.

The CHAIRMAN. We are getting around to these organizations as rapidly as we can and if you have evidence of an anti-Nazi league, or whatever its name may be, being engaged in political activities I am sure we will be glad to have them.

Mr. SMITH. Last year Buzzi came to Detroit—

The CHAIRMAN. Buzzi or Rizzi?

Mr. SMITH. Well, he has several other names.

The CHAIRMAN. But whether it is Buzzi or Rozzi, for this record he is one and the same person.

Mr. SMITH. He came to see me and asked to have a conference with me and said he was a great American firster, he asked me to come down to see him, and Mrs. Smith came with me. Immediately he began to advocate to me seditious activities. He wanted to organize, he said, to represent the Italian Fascists in New York and wanted to organize a Fascist group of the Italians. I dismissed him and I went over to the head of the F. B. I., John Bugas, and asked that that man be investigated as an enemy agent, although—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). He was then advocating a Fascist organization?

Mr. SMITH. He opened the conversation by appearing to be very pro-Italian. However, he stopped his work with the Italians and wanted to organize in New York City and Detroit and carry on other work, to exploit them.

The CHAIRMAN. And that man you asked be turned over to the F. B. I. for investigation?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I went over and saw John Bugas and said there was an Italian agent here attempting to exploit, to anti-Semitize our people by provoking them to do seditious things.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that early in May of 1943?

Mr. SMITH. It might have been, but I cannot give the time; it must have been a year ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Did this man come to you with a letter on the stationery of the United States Senate, dated May 24, 1943, reading:

MY DEAR SMITH: This will introduce Mario Buzzi, of New York, a gentleman of my acquaintance for whom I am ready to vouch.

He deserves your confidence and is eager to get some good work done among his people in the Detroit area.

That is signed by Senator Gerald P. Nye.

Did this man that you turned over to the F. B. I. present to you this letter of introduction at the time he came to see you, addressed to Gerald L. K. Smith, on the stationery of the United States Senate?

Mr. SMITH. That looks like a letter he presented, and I will continue that by saying this, that he had posed to Senator Nye as a sincere Italian supporter, and within 48 hours——

Mr. MURPHY (interposing). This necessarily has to be hearsay, Mr. Chairman. If he was present at the time Senator Nye was talking to him all right, but otherwise it is pure hearsay and pure speculation. I do not know that we ought to clutter up the record with such testimony.

Mr. SMITH. All right, then I will make it testimony. Mr. Nye called me on the telephone——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). And said that Mr. Buzzi was coming?

Mr. SMITH. No; he called me by telephone within 48 hours after Buzzi was there.

The CHAIRMAN. But he did telephone you, and we might have to get to these telephone records, but he did telephone you, did he not, prior to Buzzi's arrival and told you that Buzzi was coming?

Mr. SMITH. No, no.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, be very clear on that point, because I do want you to refresh your memory and want you to be very clear about it. Did not Senator Nye phone you from Washington prior to the arrival of Buzzi and tell you that Mr. Buzzi would come to see you with a letter in his own handwriting?

Mr. SMITH. I would rather say this, I have no memory of such a telephone call. I do have a memory of a telephone call when Mr. Nye warned me that Mr. Buzzi was a dangerous man, and an agent provocateur.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, he said, "He deserves your confidence." He seems to have started to write "gentile," and then made it "gentleman of my acquaintance for whom I am ready to vouch."

Mr. SMITH. There is nothing embarrassing about that to me. I have told you the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. I realize that, but you identified the individual who was thrown out of the convention. I did not introduce this letter until you stated he was thrown out of the convention because he was a Fascist whom you had turned over to the Department of Justice for investigating and here he appears as a friend of a United States Senator named Gerald P. Nye.

Mr. SMITH. May I clarify your remarks, Mr. Anderson, by saying that after I had turned over this report to the F. B. I. and Mr. Bugas we conducted an investigation of the man, and found him to be an agent provocator in the employ of the so-called Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League?

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Now, then, you did testify that within 2 or 3 days after this man showed up at your office you had a telephone call from Senator Nye saying he was a bad actor.

Mr. SMITH. We had a telephone conversation and the substance of it was that the man was evidently an agent provocator who was attempting to exploit the nationalist movement.

The CHAIRMAN. And the letter that Senator Nye wrote was dated May 24, 1943. Therefore, your conversation with the Senator was prior to June 1, 1943.

Mr. SMITH. I do not want to involve myself in dates either, because I might be wrong on the dates.

The CHAIRMAN. But it is in that vicinity?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. The conclusion of the whole matter as far as we were concerned was that the man had appeared in one place as a sincere, loyal American and had appeared in another place as a promoter of sedition for the purpose of doing just what is now being done, and that supports the point that I am making, whose main business is to divide, to hire private gestapo, to send a man down here to pretend to be a good American and come to me and attempt to promote sedition.

The answer, in my opinion, is that the purpose is to embarrass the nationalist movement. The whole thing is a camouflaged racket which is interfering with our personal liberty as American citizens and I petition you to petition this outfit to come before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I will be very happy to get them to come before the committee, but I am trying to find out who was sending this man all around the country.

Mr. SMITH. No; I am not going to allow this particular thing to be started in the heat of a senatorial campaign as reflecting on Senator Nye.

The CHAIRMAN. But he did write a letter of introduction.

Mr. SMITH. He did interview the man apparently and the man presented himself as a sincere American.

The CHAIRMAN. And the man also presented a letter to you from Senator Nye.

Mr. SMITH. I presume he did. Of course I will say this, that I have never confirmed that signature.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it is not a difficult signature to confirm. There are photostatic copies of it and you can compare it with his congressional frank and I will be glad to have you take this photostat of the letter as well.

Mr. SMITH. However, the authenticity of the signature of Senator Nye does not in any way affect the fundamental nature of the petition that I am making of you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But the man did present a letter to you, and he later asked to keep it, did he not, as a memento of the occasion because he sought to have in his possession a handwritten letter of a United States Senator, and wanted to keep it, and you graciously permitted him to take it with him?

Mr. SMITH. The answer is yes to that question, yes. This Non-sectarian Anti-Nazi League conducted on the part of Jewish-financed organizations is producing more anti-Semitism in America than all the so-called anti-Semites combined.

The CHAIRMAN. But this man was not sent to you by any Jewish organization. He was sent to you by Senator Gerald P. Nye of the United States Senate.

Mr. SMITH. Evidently he had presented himself as a loyal American at the instigation of this outfit for the consummate purpose of doing just what has been done.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he come to you also with a letter from any Member of Congress from the State of Michigan?

Mr. SMITH. Not to my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he have a letter from Representative Clare Hoffman?

Mr. SMITH. Not to my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Mr. Hoffman ever discuss the Buzzi matter with you?

Mr. SMITH. I was in Washington one time, I cannot tell you the date, and a call came from Mr. Hoffman's office and said, "There is a man here who is very anxious to see you and me together. His name is Buzzi."

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. I said, "Yes; he is working for the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League. It is a frame-up. Kick him out."

The CHAIRMAN. When was that, if you recall?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it subsequent to the trip he made to Detroit to see you?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How much subsequent; 60 days, 90 days, or 6 months?

Mr. SMITH. I can't remember the date, but I have no desire to forget.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you identify the period as to when it was? Was it a year ago?

Mr. SMITH. No; I can't.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it this year?

Mr. SMITH. It was not this year.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it the latter part of last year, last fall?

Mr. SMITH. I am not going to say it was not this year. It might have been this last spring.

The CHAIRMAN. It might have been this last spring?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You say this man has been sent around by Jewish-financed organizations. Mr. Hoffman in his campaign is not financed by the Jewish people, is he, to the best of your knowledge?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know of his being financed officially by any Jewish organizations. He might have some contributors.

The CHAIRMAN. I am going to hand you a letter, a photostatic copy of a letter, dated July 5, 1943, which is after you had phoned Senator Nye and after you had discussed the matter with the F. B. I., addressed to the Honorable Harrison Spangler, chairman of the National Republican Committee, Washington, D. C. [reading]—

DEAR MR. SPANGLER: This will introduce Mr. Mallo Buzzi, of New York City, whom we discussed this morning.

Sincerely,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

on the stationery of the Congress of the United States.

That was subsequent to the time that he had been exposed as an Italian wrongdoer or improper person.

Mr. SMITH. Well, I cannot say. What date is that?

The CHAIRMAN. July 5, 1943, 45 days after the Senator Nye letter, and you turned him in 2 days after that letter.

Mr. SMITH. I turned him into Mr. Burgas, but evidently Mr. Burgas did not make a report to Mr. Hoffman. This racketeer outfit had not given us up—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Now, at some time on the same day after Mr. Buzzi had been to see Mr. Spangler, in recognition of that letter and in response to this appeal and the telephone conversation with Mr. Hoffman that preceded it, Mr. Spangler, on the letterhead of the Republican National Committee on the date of July 5, 1943, wrote to Mr. Thomas J. Curran, as chairman of the New York County Republican Committee, at 54 West Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.:

DEAR MR. CURRAN: Mr. Mario Buzzi, who is the publicity director for the Sons of Italy, which publishes a semimonthly bulletin among the Italian people, desires to have some advice and help in reference to promoting Republican doctrines among the Italian people.

It has occurred to me that you might be able to help Mr. Buzzi, and I am, therefore, taking the liberty of asking him to call on you.

Mr. Curran, as you know, is now, I believe, a candidate for a rather prominent public office in the city of New York.

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN (reading):

He is especially disturbed about the propaganda which is being spread among the Italian people by Jewish refugees from Europe, who seem to be adequately financed.

Sincerely yours,

HARRISON E. SPANGLER.

Now, here is Mr. Spangler, sending Mr. Buzzi around the country. In the States where you do not have a ticket filed you are supporting Mr. Spangler's party, which is in turn supporting Mr. Buzzi. How do you account for that?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I would say that Mr. Spangler, in writing that letter, is just naive.

The CHAIRMAN. He was taken in by a slicker?

Mr. SMITH. He was taken in by an agent provocateur who works for the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League, which is supported by a bunch of short-sighted Jews.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Now, you have had a great deal to say about this political situation. I do not wish to commit you as to your future political activities in this election or any other election, and I am sure you recognize that, but there was a newspaper story that you were supporting Governor Dewey, and do you still say that you are supporting him in some States and not in others?

Mr. SMITH. No. The only people in the America First Party who have supported Mr. Dewey are certain committees in States where I am not on the ballot.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but your supporters, who have faith in you, are supporting Mr. Dewey in those States. Did you not support him, in a way, in St. Louis the other night, or did the newspapers misquote you?



Mr. SMITH. I said in St. Louis, of course, as between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Dewey we hope Mr. Dewey will win. I know that is what you want me to say.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right; I wanted to get that.

Mr. SMITH. Let me give you a little forecast in politics. That is the sort of thing that they thought would elect Willkie in Wisconsin. Willkie went into Wisconsin and said I am proud that you claim Gerald L. K. Smith is against me. If I lose it will be a victory for Gerald L. K. Smith. He could believe that because all of the newspapers had already smeared me, but they found that there was a subterranean sentiment in the country that was unaffected by any such accusations, and they sent Mr. Willkie to the showers.

The CHAIRMAN. He has not been complimentary, has he?

Mr. SMITH. No. In his public statements he has not been.

The CHAIRMAN. You understand, Mr. Smith, that I am the only nonlawyer on this committee.

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And have never had any experience in the way of conducting cross-examinations, and it comes with a great deal of difficulty to me.

Mr. SMITH. I recognize it.

The CHAIRMAN. Your followers are supporting Mr. Dewey, and you have been very vigorous in your denunciation of the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League.

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. I would now call your attention to a statement made on May 14, 1943, almost at the identical time that these people were engaged in this sort of thing that you have so vigorously condemned, if they were engaged in it. At the very time that Mr. Spangler and Mr. Hoffman and Senator Nye were being taken in by this gentleman that you identify as Mr. Buzzi. Thomas E. Dewey, then Governor of the State of New York, said and this is May 14, 1943:

The work being done by the Anti-Nazi League is exceedingly important today. Please accept my congratulations on keeping up your vital work through the war. In time of war, democracy needs moral support more than ever.

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

Would that confirm some of the things you thought about him or not?

Mr. SMITH. You read Mr. Spangler's letter and then read the letters of Mr. Hoffman and Senator Nye on the Anti-Nazi League. His letter is just as naive as Mr. Spangler's.

While you are looking for papers, may I make this observation: It may be demonstrated that you are not within your rights, Mr. Anderson, in questioning me here as a candidate, because the attorney for the O. P. A. in one of the districts has ruled that I was not a candidate for President and was not entitled to gasoline.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he cut off your gasoline?

Mr. SMITH. He never gave me any. Now, who is right, the O. P. A. or Congress?

The CHAIRMAN. As a fellow candidate I will come to your defense on that. We must keep the fraternity together and see that you get gasoline.

Mr. SMITH. Remember, the press will take that down so that it will get back to Cleveland.

I want to go down to campaign in Texas, and he won't give me gasoline. Now, why can't I get gasoline to campaign in the field? The candidate for Governor in Michigan got gasoline for 12,000 miles, and here I am, the candidate of a minority party conducting campaigns in 21 States.

I am on the Texas ballot and the Michigan ballot and I can't get gasoline.

The CHAIRMAN. You are the official head of a political party, then.

Mr. SMITH. Then why don't I get gasoline?

The CHAIRMAN. Did you file with the Clerk of the House a statement of your campaign expenditures and receipts in accordance with the law some 30 days ago?

Mr. SMITH. Where by law?

The CHAIRMAN. Did you file with the Clerk of the House a financial statement of campaign receipts and expenditures as required by the Corrupt Practices Act of the United States Government?

Mr. SMITH. There was no campaign. I had not campaigned. I was not a candidate then.

The CHAIRMAN. You have just finished saying that you have been deprived of gasoline because you are a candidate. You were just as much a candidate then as you are now. Your convention had been held, and you were a candidate, a write-in candidate, in all of these States which you have listed.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you file with the Clerk of the House a statement of your campaign receipts and expenditures as required by law?

Mr. SMITH. I was not a candidate 30 days ago.

The CHAIRMAN. You were nominated on August 29. The requirement of this report came in September. Has anything happened between August 29 and the present date which makes you more of a candidate now than you were then? In view of the fact that you have partially withdrawn as a candidate and started supporting Mr. Dewey in spots, are you less of a candidate now than you were on August 29 and 30?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you are the same person——

Mr. SMITH (interposing). Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). That you were when you were nominated on August 29 or 30 as a candidate for the Presidency, and you have just said to this committee that this O. P. A. attorney has denied you were a candidate by not giving you gasoline to make this tour in Texas where you are a write-in candidate.

Mr. SMITH. No, I am on the ballot in Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. You are on the ballot in Texas?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you are certainly a candidate. Under that theory did you refuse to obey the law of the United States Government?

Mr. SMITH. I did not refuse to obey the law of the United States Government. I was not a candidate; I was only a candidate 24 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you not a candidate now?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You became a candidate, did you not, on August 29? Let's answer that: On August 29 you became a candidate for the Presidency?

Mr. SMITH. That afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you changed your status as a candidate from that day to this?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. No?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Therefore you were a candidate on August 29, and are today?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In the intervening period the Corrupt Practices Act of the United States Government required you to file certain information with the Clerk of this House. That blank was sent to you, and this committee wrote you as well. Have you filed with either this committee or with the Clerk of the House the report called for by the law?

Mr. SMITH. No; I construed this appearance here as the fulfillment of that obligation.

The CHAIRMAN. And if we had not granted you this appearance you would have elected to violate the law by refusing to file a report with the Clerk of the House?

Mr. SMITH. No; I would not have refused, and I did not refuse.

The CHAIRMAN. This appearance before this committee might satisfy our requirements, but does it fulfill in any way, in your mind, the requirement of the statute?

Mr. SMITH. According to the consummation of this hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing has nothing to do with the tradition, with the practice, and with the legal requirement that you file with the Clerk of the House a statement showing your receipts and expenditures as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States. That law was on the statute books prior to the creation of this committee. The report was to be filed subsequent to the time that you became a candidate. Now, would you try to tell us under what theory you are defying the law?

Mr. SMITH. I am not defying the law, I am not under any theory, and there is nothing at my command which I desire to hide from the Congress that pertains to my campaign expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. I am merely trying to find if this is part of the same pattern which led you to oppose the sugar-rationing program, which led you to oppose the gasoline-rationing program, and which led you to oppose rationing all the way through, and which has seemingly led you into opposition of the corrupt practices law of the United States Government at the present time. Is there any explanation you can give for that?

Mr. SMITH. You are entitled, Mr. Anderson, to that statement as part of your comment in the committee, but I have not. I did not oppose the rationing program. I criticized its conduct, but I have not opposed or defied the law. I am not even criticizing the law.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you are in violation of the law, are you not?

Mr. MURPHY. Will you yield for one question, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Why did you not file your statement with the Clerk of the House between the 1st and the 10th day of September 1944?

Mr. SMITH. Because I had not conducted a campaign, and I had not spent any money.

Mr. MURPHY. The law calls for a statement. Why did you not file a statement advising the Clerk of the House in accordance with law as to what you had done in regard to receipts and expenditures?

Mr. SMITH. I assumed that my appearance before this committee would fulfill that obligation.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time you were required to make a statement to the Clerk of the House you had not arranged for an appearance before this committee.

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You were then in default. Therefore you could not possibly have anticipated that your appearance before this committee would fulfill that requirement.

Mr. SMITH. I was unaware that filing by the 10th of September was necessary, Mr. Chairman. I knew in our moral code that I was going to do the right thing.

The CHAIRMAN. No question has been raised on that. I simply ask you why you did not file it.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, then, in the absence of that filing can you furnish to the committee at this time some indication of what the expenses have thus far been and what the contributions have thus far been? Did you have any expenses in connection with the convention in Detroit?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How much were those expenses, roughly?

Mr. SMITH. Now, those expenses, you understand I have no desire to hedge on that, but it is understood that those expenses were not a part of my campaign as a candidate.

The CHAIRMAN. But they become a part of the expenses of the America First Party.

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Therefore the party is involved when it has convention expenses.

Mr. SMITH. They were approximately \$1,000.

The CHAIRMAN. \$1,000?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That represents what, rental?

Mr. SMITH. Rental, mailing, notification, printing of credentials, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. Badges and all of the miscellaneous things that go with the ordinary convention?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And since the date of your nomination you have traveled in some parts of this country?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you incurred expenses in connection with that travel?

Mr. SMITH. I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you kept an itemized record of those expenses?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you supply it to this committee within a reasonable time?

Mr. SMITH. I can.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us any idea now as to what the amount has been?

Mr. SMITH. I would have to deal in round figures, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be understood.

Mr. SMITH. With the understanding that I can support those figures in detail.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly. Would you, therefore, deal in round figures for us?

Mr. SMITH. I would say that it would run between \$2,500 and \$3,500 since the 1st of September.

The CHAIRMAN. And from what source has that money been obtained?

Mr. SMITH. The rank and file of my supporters.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, do you have a list person by person as to who has made those contributions?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you file that with the committee?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I have observed as to many of those who have appeared before your committee prior to this hearing that you have requested the names of people who have contributed \$100 or more.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sorry. I incorrectly made my request of you. Will you file with the committee a list of any persons who have contributed \$100 or more?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. We are not going to make any different requirement of you than anyone else.

Mr. SMITH. I will be only to happy to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. And you will file a statement showing the total amount of the contributions.

I will say for your own information, since you mentioned Mr. Hillman a while ago, that the Political Action Committee did not restrict its filing only to those people who contributed \$100 or more but offered to turn over to this committee every receipt for 50 cents or any other amount which the committee received, and to permit us to be custodians of those receipts so that any curious person at any date might check them and find out the name of every person who contributed to the campaign. You have, however, a perfect right to say that you are going to report expenditures in excess of \$10, and contributions in excess of \$100.

Mr. SMITH. That is right. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on that statement. Under ordinary circumstances I would not hesitate to offer voluntarily to file the names of the individuals who have given small amounts, but I asserted that there are three notorious privately financed Gestapo organizations in this country specializing in the task of harassing and persecuting persons who are enrolled in nationalistic groups.

Mr. MURPHY. Will you yield for a question, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Would you say the same thing is true of the C. I. O. at the present time?

Mr. SMITH. You mean that they are the victim of such organizations?

Mr. MURPHY. Are they not treated the same way pretty generally?

Mr. SMITH. I will say this, that for administration purposes Mr. Hillman is in power, and that he would be unwise to file the names of his individual members without—

Mr. MURPHY (interposing). That is not my question.

Mr. SMITH (continuing). Without protection.

Mr. MURPHY. That is not my question. My question is, Do you not think similar groups, such as you have outlined, have been spreading and printing views about the C. I. O. the same as these groups you have been talking about that would discuss your particular contributions?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I will say this, I will say that no man in America represents more the antithesis of what I stand for in political government—

Mr. MURPHY (interposing). You are not answering my question.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, I am; than Mr. Hillman.

Mr. MURPHY. Now, will you answer my question?

Mr. SMITH. But in spite of that fact I think that he and some of his associates have been the victims of persecution. I do not think that any outfit should be struck below the belt.

Mr. MURPHY. Then you do agree that vicious attacks are being made upon the millions of members of the C. I. O. who are contributing to this campaign, do you, unfair attacks?

Mr. SMITH. I am aware of some attacks that are unfair.

Mr. MURPHY. May I ask one more question, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Have you had any contributions in excess of \$100?

Mr. SMITH. If there have been any in excess of \$100 it has been people who have given \$10 ten times or \$20 five times, and I will have to look at my records, and I might find as many as two or three or four that have given \$100, but I will have to look at the records.

Mr. MURPHY. Have you had any contributions in excess of \$100, I mean in the present organization or corporation from January 1, 1944, to the present moment?

Mr. SMITH. There might be four or five.

Mr. MURPHY. What was your largest contribution, to the best of your judgment?

Mr. SMITH. I would not want to say until I see my records.

Mr. MURPHY. Will you be good enough to give us your best judgment?

Mr. SMITH. As to how many?

Mr. MURPHY. No; the largest contribution.

Mr. SMITH. As to what was the largest amount, what was the largest contribution?

Mr. MURPHY. The largest contribution; you surely have some personal knowledge and recollection.

Mr. SMITH. I would say between \$100 and \$500.

Mr. MURPHY. Who was your largest contributor?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know.

Mr. MURPHY. What is your best recollection?

Mr. SMITH. I would not want to assert that, because I would want to look at the records first, but I have no desire to evade the answer.

Mr. MURPHY. Can you name a single contributor in excess of \$100 in the year 1944, and will you name it now?

Mr. SMITH. Well, do I have to do that? I would like to do it altogether. I do not like to single out a citizen and name his name for the publicity going out. I would rather have it to be a part of the ultimate report.

Mr. MURPHY. I am not insisting; I am just asking that you do it. I am not insisting.

Mr. SMITH. I would rather make a report of all of them so that any who have given more than \$100 will be given in one report.

Mr. MURPHY. Where are those records?

Mr. SMITH. In Detroit.

Mr. MURPHY. All right, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I have a great many questions that I perhaps ought to get into. In March, referring to a rally to be held in St. Louis on March 25, 1944, you stated:

The cost of the rent and sound equipment of this building will be \$400. Postage and printed matter as well as traveling expenses for the distinguished speakers will be another \$600. Thus our St. Louis rally will cost about \$1,000 before the day of the meeting.

Do you recall whether it did or not come close to those figures?

Mr. SMITH. I think that is about right. That is in March some time.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. Then in June you said, and I quote:

It has cost us an extra \$2,000 to open our activities in the East, and with your help it has been made possible.

It will cost us about \$1,200 to put on the Chicago meeting. I am counting on you to help pay this bill.

You have been raising money right along?

Mr. SMITH. For this preliminary activity?

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. In August you said, "We should buy radio time immediately"—maybe I better quote a little ahead of that—

We realize that we will be limited this first year in our campaign, but we must take steps to get on all the ballots possible this year and then be on all the ballots in 1946 and 1948. With your help we can carry on this nationalistic crusade.

Thanks to you and others we have been able to pay our bills having to do with the two big meetings held just prior to the Chicago conventions and in connection with our special official caucus \* \* \*. We should buy radio time immediately.

May I divide that up and ask first what two big meetings were held just prior to the Chicago conventions?

Mr. SMITH. One was held in the Hotel Stevens ballroom.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the time the Bricker people leased it?

Mr. SMITH. That is not the way to define it, but the time we held a meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Bricker people were conspicuous by their absence, even though they supposedly controlled the hall?

Mr. SMITH. They did not control the hall.

The CHAIRMAN. I said "supposedly."

Mr. SMITH. We had rented the hall and the hall belonged to us.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the member of this committee, Mr. Clarence Brown, who was campaign manager for Bricker, subscribe to that statement?

Mr. SMITH. I do not think his subscription would be necessary. We rented the hall and had made a down payment and had signed a contract for the use of the ballroom. Two days before the meeting was to be held, we received a notice that the contract for the ballroom had been cancelled due to pressure from the Republican Committee. The Bricker committee had not rented the ballroom. They merely had headquarters in a foyer just outside the ballroom.

The CHAIRMAN. With all of this pressure from the Republican National Committee against you do you not find it a little inconvenient now to turn and support some of their candidates?

Mr. SMITH. I am not supporting Mr. Dewey. I think he is worse than Roosevelt in some respects.

The CHAIRMAN. There are some members of this committee who might be inclined to agree with you.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I notice in one of your publications you say the only reason Roosevelt is preferable to Dewey is because he might not last as long.

Mr. SMITH. I will let that stand.

The CHAIRMAN. I am trying to skip through some of these things. You have a very strong aversion to Mr. Willkie, I assume.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I assume that from your article which you circulated May 30, 1943.

Mr. SMITH. I think he is a New Deal fifth columnist within the Republican Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Both candidates seem to be trying to get him over to their side of the fence. You think he is sort of a plague on both of their houses, do you?

Mr. SMITH. They overestimate his strength, that is, the Republicans do.

The CHAIRMAN. Who has been paying the costs of the meetings in the various towns in which you have been campaigning the last few weeks?

Mr. SMITH. This is, of course, borne in two ways, by collections taken in the meeting and by contributions sent in by supporters.

The CHAIRMAN. And the collections taken in in the meetings become just the same a part of your campaign receipts for your candidacy for president?

Mr. SMITH. Definitely. Every dollar received in these meetings is sealed in an envelope, sealed and audited at our office.

The CHAIRMAN. And you will report the expenditures resulting from the receipt of that money just the same as everything else?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir. May I say for your edification that all of these questions were gone into by the Internal Revenue Department which conducted the investigation for a year and used something like 40 agents in it. They went through the whole system. They used those envelopes which had been used in our meetings, and they were used on the same basis that we are using them now.

The CHAIRMAN. While I appreciate that information, I do, in turn, want to advise you that the Bureau of Internal Revenue will not make



available to us any information contained in a personal internal revenue report of yours.

Mr. SMITH. Accusations very serious were filed with the Internal Revenue Department, and I was given a very clean bill of health for handling my moneys.

The CHAIRMAN. Except 1 year you did make a civil settlement, did you not?

Mr. SMITH. They refused to allow me to take off for a car which had been used in carrying on my campaigns.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that in the 1941 return?

Mr. SMITH. That is right, a car and a mimeograph machine. However, the Department assured me that it represented no intention whatsoever to evade the law.

The CHAIRMAN. When you file this report of campaign receipts and expenditures will you, at the same time, file with us a list of the officers of your organization?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You saw this morning that we received a list of officers filed by one association, and we would have them filed of all of the groups. We need that.

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You stated in this item I read a moment ago that you ought to buy radio time. You have been speaking, have you not, since some time in 1939 over station WJR in Detroit?

Mr. SMITH. No; since the spring of 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you started in September of 1939 at the time that Father Coughlin got off the radio, is not that correct?

Mr. SMITH. No; we were on the radio at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. I will start over again. You speak every Sunday night on station WJR in Detroit?

Mr. SMITH. I have spoken from one to three times a week for over 4 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the regular Sunday night program cost you \$375 a broadcast?

Mr. SMITH. Approximately.

The CHAIRMAN. For a while, and then it was raised to over \$400, is that correct?

Mr. SMITH. I do not have the figures.

The CHAIRMAN. Who made the financial arrangements for your first broadcast over Station WJR in September 1939?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Hubert Lucker.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Mr. Harry Bennett make any arrangements with the station to guarantee the account?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Harry Bennett, I think, at one time helped raise \$2,000 for radio time.

The CHAIRMAN. Who guaranteed the first account with that radio station when you started your broadcasts and came to your financial assistance?

Mr. SMITH. I assume Mr. Lucker would know better than that.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean he would know better than you might know?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Mr. Bennett go to Station WJR and guarantee the radio time would be paid for?

Mr. SMITH. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Could it be possible he went there and guaranteed it would be paid for?

Mr. SMITH. I think the first 4 weeks on that radio were sustaining programs.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was sponsor of the sustaining programs?

Mr. SMITH. Well, the station is always the sponsor. A sustaining program is a program where a station, for instance, various viewpoints had been expressed on the radio, and I was asked to speak for 4 weeks, and I did speak for 4 weeks, and then after that program was terminated we felt we should buy time on the radio.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not recall whether Mr. Bennett arranged for the purchase of that time with the station?

Mr. SMITH. Not at that particular time. I do know that Mr. Bennett at one time or another helped to raise \$2,000.

The CHAIRMAN. \$2,000?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; that was in 1939.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. Have you had in these previous years in the Committee of One Million or other organizations any contributions which ran into large sums?

Mr. SMITH. In 1939 and 1940 we concentrated our attacks on communism, nazi-ism, and fascism, as we still do, and at that time we received contributions small and large from a wide variety of individuals.

The CHAIRMAN. You had solicitors working in New York and around the country, did you?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Was John Cecil, for example, in New York, a solicitor in 1939?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, was he in 1941 and 1942?

Mr. SMITH. I think he helped to raise some money for radio time that I bought in Washington in 1937 or 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. William H. Byington, Jr., of Elizabeth, N. J. He helped some. Did he operate in 1937 or 1938 under a contract by which he got a percentage?

Mr. SMITH. If he did, he worked with someone else on that.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean with your organization.

Mr. SMITH. No; not from our organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose he reported in his income that he did get 50 percent of the contributions in 1937 or 1938, would you be in a position to say that that statement was true or false?

Mr. SMITH. I would rather say this, that that was an arrangement between himself and the donor.

The CHAIRMAN. The donor says, "You can have half of this if you will turn the other half in to the Committee of One Million"?

Mr. SMITH. I would not want to say that; I am not in a position to confirm those facts.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have a Mrs. Clare Havermyer in New York who was in charge of women solicitors at one time?

Mr. SMITH. I am not aware of the fact that Mrs. Havermyer was a solicitor in support of my activities. Mrs. Havermyer was a woman who attended my meetings sometime away back in 1937-38.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you get a contribution as large as \$18,000 from one individual at any time, that you recall?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Henry W. Marsh, Sr., 80 Maiden Lane, New York City; could he possibly have made a contribution payable \$1,500 on the 1st and 15th day of each month for a period of 6 months?

Mr. SMITH. I have no knowledge of that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is Henry W. Marsh, Sr., 80 Maiden Lane, New York City.

Mr. SMITH. May I say, may I point out something concerning this report, or this document, that you have there? When the Internal Revenue Department investigated my affairs, they discovered that someone had seized my accounts and envelopes and had raised those amounts in consistent form. For instance, they would find an envelope, \$500. They would locate the individual, put him under oath, and find that he had given \$5 at a meeting.

In the spring of 1938 I was completely broke, I was penniless, I was not able to pay my office rent, and the Pennsylvania Hotel in New York seized—or had my files on store, and sometime during that period those files fell into the hands of people who were not my friends. All of those files were submitted completely to the Internal Revenue Department and were used in investigating my activities.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, in connection with political activities again, in the campaign of 1938, in the State of Ohio, did a man named Frank Poulson, who was chairman of the Ohio State Democratic Committee, and Miss Myrna Smith, secretary to former Governor Davey, make contributions to your organization?

Mr. SMITH. Not to my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. If I used the sum of \$12,000 would that—

Mr. SMITH. It would not mean a thing to me.

The CHAIRMAN. It would not mean a thing?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Frank Poulson?

Mr. SMITH. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. And he did not at any time contribute to you or to your organization?

Mr. SMITH. He did not.

The CHAIRMAN. In 1938?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know R. J. Miller, of the Manufacturers Association of Ohio, and Frank Boggs, State chairman of the Ohio Republican Committee?

Mr. SMITH. What is the last name?

The CHAIRMAN. Frank Boggs.

Mr. SMITH. No; the name does not mean anything to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know the name of R. J. Miller, of the Manufacturers Association?

Mr. SMITH. That does mean something to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he make a contribution to you in 1938?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If I used the sum of \$8,000, that would not mean anything?

Mr. SMITH. It would not mean a thing. I held a series of meetings in Toledo and those meetings were paid for by contributions taken

up in our rallies, and those rallies cost the ordinary sum of conducting large rallies.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been some report that you were of assistance to Governor Davey, or that your group was; I do not mean this personally. That was in the spring of 1938, and in the fall you were of some assistance to Governor Bricker's campaign.

Mr. SMITH. In the spring of 1938 and the fall of 1938 I carried on regular meetings, anti-Communist rallies, throughout the State of Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. But you do not recall the receipt by your organization of some \$12,000 from the Democratic organization?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Early of that year or later?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I am afraid I have imposed a little bit on you by continuing too long at one stretch.

Mr. SMITH. No; on the contrary, Mr. Chairman. You have in your files there familiar suggestions of fabrication which have been filed against me with all sorts of bureaus in the last 5 years. I am only too happy to face these questions as an important task to fulfill, not only as it pertains to our own organization but as it helps you to fulfill your responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask if it would be agreeable to resume at 2 o'clock? We do not want to overwork anybody.

Mr. SMITH. The only qualification I would make there, Mr. Chairman, is that I speak in Baltimore tonight and I would like to be out of this room by 4 o'clock, if possible.

The CHAIRMAN. I think I can limit my questions and then allow others to go on. Thank you very much.

The committee will recess until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon a recess was taken until 2 p. m.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

The recess having expired, the special committee reconvened at 2 p. m., Hon. Clinton P. Anderson (chairman), presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

I do know that Mr. Smith has to be in Baltimore this evening, as he stated just before we recessed. When we made our original plans he said he had a speaking engagement in Baltimore today, and he desires to leave here at 4 o'clock. For that reason we are going to try to see that we conclude by 4 o'clock. I think I have taken more time than I should, and I will reserve the right to come back perhaps a little later. In the meantime, Mr. Gathings, if you have any questions to ask of the witness, this is your opportunity to do so.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, may I, for the benefit of my secretary who is here, ask who are the members of the committee who sat this morning and who are with the committee this afternoon?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. John Sparkman, of Alabama; Mr. E. C. Gathings, of Arkansas; Mr. John Murphy, of Pennsylvania; and the chairman.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Smith, you answered the questions propounded to you by the chairman in such a way as to leave in the minds of most people the impression that you do not hesitate in the least in answering

questions that are asked. Now I would like to ask you something about yourself, just for the record, if you do not mind answering such questions.

I would like to know where you were born, if you will answer that question, please.

Mr. SMITH. I was born in a home, in the manse of a preacher in Pardeeville, Wis., 1898.

Mr. GATHINGS. I would like to ask you something of your parentage, if you do not object.

Mr. SMITH. My father retired from the Gospel of the ministry on his golden wedding anniversary, which was on Christmas, 1936. He is now 81 and my mother is 79, and they live in Delevan, Wis., 1 mile removed from my sister, the other member of the family, who is the wife of a farmer near Delevan.

I was educated in the elementary schools of Wisconsin, took my undergraduate work at Valparaiso University at Valparaiso, Ind., and my graduate work at Butler University in Indianapolis.

I was ordained to the ministry and served as pastor in the church commonly known as the Christian Church of the Disciples of Christ until 1932.

Mr. GATHINGS. After your college career, what line of endeavor did you follow?

Mr. SMITH. I was pastor of the University Church which served the students of Butler University in Indianapolis. Late in the 20's my wife was taken ill and it was necessary for us, although I had been installed for life—it was necessary either to send Mrs. Smith west or to some climate that was better for an infection of the lung, or locate in some other community. After a careful survey, we located at Shreveport, La. Although Shreveport is in Louisiana, and everybody thinks Louisiana is wet and damp and full of alligators, Shreveport has the Texas climate; it has an upland or piney woods climate, and was very constructive to Mrs. Smith's health.

Early in my career in Louisiana I became acquainted with the late Huey P. Long. He was the only public man I found down there that was interested in other human beings, that seemed to care whether anybody had an education, or a road, or a hospital, or anything else. We became fast friends and then we developed a philosophy concerning the preservation of our American Government against what we believed was the threat of communism and centralized bureaucracy. We joined hands in 1932 to organize a campaign to build a new political group.

Mr. GATHINGS. Did you advise with Senator Long in any of his races for governor?

Mr. SMITH. Of course, it is easy to boast about your relationship to a man that is dead; he cannot deny it. I will say that we were rather intimate, especially after he came to the Senate.

Mr. GATHINGS. It has been alleged that he had a real close friend and an ally who was a minister of the Gospel, who gave him quite a lot of passages from the Scriptures that he used quite advantageously in his various campaigns for public office. Are you that man?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Long was one of the first public men in America to be effectively smeared by a well-organized smear machine which was financed by the Old Regular machine in New Orleans, the Standard

Oil Co., the Farley machine when Jim Farley was head of the Democratic Party.

The thing that stimulated this, or one thing that stimulated the smear campaign, was when he forced the Bell Telephone Co. to pay back some \$1,000,000 in overcharges that they had made against consumers; when he insisted that the refineries of Louisiana refine domestic oil first or pay a penalty of 5 cents a barrel on imported oil; when he insisted that pipe lines be made common carriers. It was the custom of the Standard pipe line to come to you, after you had discovered oil on 40 acres of land, and oil was worth \$2 a barrel, and say, "I will give you 25 cents or nothing." You do not own a pipe line. He fought to make those pipe lines common carriers.

He was the first southern politician ever to ask for universal education for Negroes. It does not take any courage to be for Negroes in the North where they vote habitually, but it does take courage to have a humanitarian outlook on the Negro question in the South. He fought for universal education for Negroes and universal education for all children.

He fought for a general hospitalization program. He introduced the idea of a severance tax on oil; took out 11 cents a barrel on oil, to build up the educational and hospitalization facilities of the State.

Our timber was being slaughtered by an extreme taxation program. It was his idea that the harvest tax be introduced and the timber not be taxed until it was cut, thus not tempting the owner of the timber to cut the timber prematurely.

He was the one that fought the exploitation of the depositors in the bank holiday crisis. We only lost 11 banks in Louisiana. He invited the big bankers of New Orleans to come to the Governor's mansion at Baton Rouge, stationed State police at the door, and kept them as his guests for 3 days until the bank crisis was solved. We lost 11 banks while Mississippi and Tennessee and other places were losing two and three and four hundred.

He inspired the combined animosity of the feudal lords of Louisiana and the Washington Democratic machine. That combination can produce all kinds of unfavorable publicity for a man in public life.

Mr. GATHINGS. Did you hold any official position in the Long regime?

Mr. SMITH. No; I held no official position, sought no office and desired none, and financed myself.

Mr. GATHINGS. Did you offer any suggestions to him in the compilation of his speeches?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I offered some suggestions, but anyone that was close to Senator Huey Long knows that he did not require a ghost writer in order to think up a speech.

Mr. GATHINGS. Well, I have heard him speak.

Mr. SMITH. There were no ghosts in his family. There were no Sam Rosenmans writing speeches for him.

Mr. GATHINGS. And from the ovation given you soon after Senator Long's death, over in Arkansas, I do not believe there are any ghost writers in your family.

Mr. SMITH. Well, I hope not.

Mr. GATHINGS. Now, Mr. Smith, after you left Louisiana, where did you go?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I would like to stay in Louisiana a little while longer, in this questioning. I would like to explain, when Huey Long was killed, there was an anxiety on the part of the National Democratic machine to take over the Long organization. There were seven leaders there in the Long organization. I was one of the seven leaders. Mr. Harold Ickes and the money-spending authorities in Washington had earmarked something like \$200,000,000 to be spent in Louisiana when, as, and if Huey Long was not in power. Immediately upon his death we had their representative come into Louisiana, Mr. Joseph Keenan, then the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, under Mr. Cummings.

They gave assurances to those people who had been elected on the Huey Long ticket that if they would come to the Philadelphia convention and never mention the name "Huey Long," and Governor Leche would agree to favor Roosevelt and say that everything was lovely, they would drop the indictments that had then been accumulated by the Internal Revenue Department, they would purge them of their guilt, and release the \$200,000,000 to be spent in Louisiana.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that if the gentleman intends to get out at 4 o'clock, I intend to ask questions on some pertinent matters relative to this party before 4 o'clock.

Mr. SMITH. Well, this is rather important to me. It involves \$200,000,000 worth of spending. So, out of the seven men that were interviewed by a representative of the Democratic machine, I was the only one that would not sell. The others went over, lock, stock, and barrel, and they spent the money in Louisiana and I left Louisiana, not against my will—I left Louisiana voluntarily—and proceeded to work out a plan to organize a national organization.

Mr. GATHINGS. What year was that?

Mr. SMITH. Late 1936, the summer of 1936.

Mr. GATHINGS. And where did you go?

Mr. SMITH. I went first to New York City.

Mr. GATHINGS. How long did you stay there?

Mr. SMITH. I went to New York City because I felt New York City was the center of world intrigue. Any man that wanted to know what was going on in the world had not completed his education until he found out what was going on in New York City. I saw that every time one of our men sold out, he went up to New York City and saw somebody. I wanted to know what was going on in New York City and I went up to New York City and I found out what was going on up there. I spoke in the ballrooms and the public halls of New York City for a year and a half, and submitted myself to the questions of anyone who attended the meeting, and after I had been there a year and a half, I felt that I was the graduate of a seminar. Then, when we launched our mass movement, we felt that it should be launched from the Middle West and we had to decide between Chicago, Cleveland, and Detroit.

Mr. GATHINGS. When were these publications first put on the newsstands, about which you testified here this morning in answer to questions by the chairman on certain articles that appeared in them?

Mr. SMITH. You mean "The Cross and the Flag"?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. "The Cross and the Flag" was printed first in the spring of 1942.

Mr. GATHINGS. Do you preach at the present time?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir; I resigned from the ministry when I entered politics. I address congregations, but when I address congregations I address them just as audiences. I never use the term "Reverend" in any of the literature that I use. The only time it is used is when a newspaper pulls it out of the morgue; but that does not mean that I have a cynical attitude toward the church. In fact, I believe in the church more than I ever did.

Mr. GATHINGS. You have made about 10 speeches in the last 12 days. I believe you testified this morning?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

Mr. GATHINGS. And they were in the interest of your campaign for the Presidency?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

Mr. GATHINGS. I want to ask you this question. On page 3 of your America First Party platform, under "Jews," there is this statement:

The fact that a recent poll by the University of Denver showed two-thirds of the American people anti-Semitic reveals that the Jewish problem presses for an early, intelligent, and Christian solution.

I want to ask you the question, what area was covered by that poll made by the University of Denver?

Mr. SMITH. The findings of that poll are not mine. I do not have them in my hand. But without committing myself too completely, I will say that I have the impression that it included the whole United States.

Mr. GATHINGS. How many inquiries were sent out?

Mr. SMITH. I cannot interpret the poll except to say that the Denver University poll is accepted as being one of the polls looked upon as academically sound.

Mr. GATHINGS. You base your platform, your attempt to get members into your organization, on anti-Semitism, do you not?

Mr. SMITH. We base what?

Mr. GATHINGS. You base your organization on the principles outlined here in this platform?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, yes; these 40 points that constitute the foundation of the literature of the party.

Mr. GATHINGS. You ask the question, "Is it true that 95 percent of the founders of communism were \* \* \* Jews?" You state that in the form of a question in your platform, is that true?

Mr. SMITH. The interpretation of that should be this. A survey of the causes of anti-Semitism revealed that those are the questions that seem to lie at the foundation of anti-Semitism. Now, if a positive answer to those questions is producing anti-Jewism, or anti-Semitism, in America, is that correct or is it incorrect? No conclusion must be reached until the facts are available.

Mr. GATHINGS. By virtue of asking such questions you are of the opinion that you can build up your organization membership, is that right?

Mr. SMITH. That is a plank in our platform, just as the plank in the Democratic and Republican platforms dealing with the Jewish question was a plank, except that they used weasel words and did not face the issue. We faced the issue, and recognize it as a real problem. And anyone that denies that the Jewish problem is a real problem in America today is either uninformed or dishonest.



Mr. GATHINGS. What is your idea of what should be done?

Mr. SMITH. It should be studied as a real problem and recognized as one of our real problems, just as the platform says. And no conclusion should be reached until the facts are available. No party should assume that they can solve that problem in a 3-hour session. They should recognize it as one of the real problems of the Nation, the tide of reaction against the Jew that is developing in America. I do not think that these gestapo organizations like the Anti-Defamation League, and the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League, and Rex Stout, and the so-called Reverend Birkhead's Friends of Democracy, financed by Jews mainly—I do not think those three organizations are helping to solve the problem. I think they are racketeering on the Jews, raising money from the Jews to knock down straw men, and in order to keep their straw men, they have got to prove that somebody like Gerald Smith is out to drink the blood of the Jews. It is a racket from top to bottom. And inasmuch as these three outfits are campaigning against me as a candidate for President, I petition this committee to call the officers of the Anti-Defamation League here, and the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League and the so-called Friends of Democracy, and question them concerning the source of their revenue which they are spending to fight men like myself and others.

Mr. GATHINGS. Every organization it has been suggested we go into, we have questioned; I want to tell you that.

Mr. SMITH. Well, I am going to make an assertion that before you get those three outfits in here, you are going to experience some synthetic interference that you have not seen before, unless you are alert as to what is going on. They have got the power to cause you considerable inconvenience before you get them to tell you exactly where they are getting their money. And I put that in the record as something for you to go by.

Mr. GATHINGS. Well, I would like very much to have them in.

Mr. SMITH. For instance, let me show you something. There is an envelope that has not been opened [indicating]. It is one of several scores that have been sent to friends and employees of mine. This is from the Friends of Democracy, Inc. My secretary called them up in New York the other day and said she would need some of these in Washington today and would they rush her a package. They rushed her a package. It was available. Look at the high amount of postage on it; no charge.

I am going to open it in your presence. I have not opened it myself. There is an expensive brochure devoted exclusively to an attack on Gerald L. K. Smith.

Mr. GATHINGS. How do you know? You have not read that pamphlet.

Mr. SMITH. Oh, I know. I have had—we have had hundreds of them. They are always sent out free, in unlimited quantities. All we need to do is write for them.

Who is furnishing this money to this outfit to fight a candidate for President? And I call your attention on the last page there to this sentence: "If you know people who are supporting Smith, tell them to stop it. It may cause them trouble." Who has authorized this self-appointed Gestapo agency to inspire fear in the hearts of my followers? This is another one of the outfits that employ agents provocateur

to stir up trouble. Who was Bussi, who came into our convention as a delegate employed to inspire our people to embrace his subversive activities?

I want it to be a part of the record here, as a citizen of the United States—I am petitioning this committee—I would like you also to go into the files of the Dies committee. I understand they have some very important information as to these outfits, that ought to be brought to light.

The CHAIRMAN. Most of the reports of the Dies committee have been published, have they not? I think they are all available.

Mr. SMITH. I am told that some of these findings have not been published. I do not know. However, I am not asking this committee to depend on the Dies committee. I would like to see these three outfits—I claim these three outfits are not friends of the Jews; they are enemies of the Jews, and anyone who thinks the way to defend the Jews is to hire gestapo agents to run around over America and harass people, they ought to brand them traitors to their country. They are betraying their own people. And I cannot help but believe that the real statesmen within the Jewish race are as opposed to this—at least they should be—as I am.

For instance, you demonstrated this morning that somebody had a copy of a letter written by Clare Hoffman to Mr. Spangler, and a copy of a letter by Mr. Spangler to a candidate for the Senate, Mr. Kern of New York. Who got those letters; who stole those letters; who furnished them to this committee? What is going on here? Is that a private gestapo, or is that a bureaucratic gestapo? How do you come into the possession of these expensive brochures. Has your committee been given unlimited funds to go out and harass people, or could they have been furnished to you by people like Carlson, for instance, who had a foreign-born father with several aliases, who tries to brand American citizens?

Mr. MURPHY. With all due respect, what is wrong with a foreign-born person? Why do you say that? Is there anything wrong with a foreign-born person?

Mr. SMITH. Of course not. My wife's father and mother were both born in Denmark.

Mr. MURPHY. Why do you call them "foreign-born"? Is that to create prejudice or what? Why do you designate them as "foreign-born"? What has that thing to do with it?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I impugn the integrity of a man who comes here from a foreign country and tries to impugn the patriotism of the people who have been here all the time—men like Fish, Brooks, and Lindbergh.

Mr. MURPHY. Did not the Pilgrims come here some years ago and they were foreign-born?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, but they did not come here—

Mr. MURPHY. Is there anything wrong with a person because he is foreign-born?

Mr. SMITH. No; absolutely not. I am a defender of the foreign born. However, I think we have all we need, and we ought to stop it right now until we have some jobs for the boys when they come back from the war.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one thing I would like to ask, that is, in my examination this morning I tried hard—I might not have suc-

ceeded—to keep personalities out. There are many things the committee has received voluntarily, which have been mailed in to it, which do constitute slander, perhaps, and certainly abuse individuals. Mr. Carlson, whom I have never met and whose book I have never read, is not here and has no opportunity to defend himself, and if possible we would like to keep his name out of it, and other names of that nature before the committee, unless there is a definite reason for bringing them in.

I am not trying to defend what Mr. Carlson said, but I do think, as a Campaign Expenditures Committee, we should study the activities of all groups, and they should be covered very consistently and thoroughly. But up to the present time we have tried to avoid personalities, and I would appreciate it if you won't indulge in personalities.

Mr. GATHINGS. I am just anxious to get Mr. Smith's background into the record, and any other portions of his life he would like to testify about, I would like to have in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to say and have it strictly understood that my observation was not intended and was not directed as a criticism against the gentleman's [Mr. Gathings'] questions, which I thought were perfectly within his rights.

Mr. SMITH. I feel the same way about it. I will say this, that if there is a little display of emotion in the way I handled one or two questions, I happen to know that those three outfits have prepared big, thick brochures on me and tried to peddle them to all the bureaus—Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, congressional committees, senatorial committees, newspapers—

The CHAIRMAN. I will say the only person who has tried to peddle any information to the chairman of the committee was an institution or group that wanted to sell me a list of contributions received by the Committee for Constitutional Government. I am going to continue to try to get that information by private examination and not the payment of money.

Mr. SMITH. The word "sell" I was using as a figure. I meant to convince you that you should expect this stuff. It is well known that those three outfits are conducting a private Gestapo harassment of me, and I petition again that you investigate those three—the Anti-Defamation League, the so-called Friends of Democracy, and the so-called Anti-Nazi League.

The CHAIRMAN. May I also say that the committee has tried hard to get before it people who are actually engaged in political activities and, at the same time, is trying to get before it, in as orderly a fashion as it can, these other agencies. Quite a statement was made here not long ago by Mr. Kamp, to the effect we had gotten his organization in here at the request of Sidney Hillman. Nothing could have been further from the truth. I received through the mail a copy of a pamphlet entitled, "Vote C. I. O. and Get a Soviet America," sent by the Constitutional Educational League. I called the committee clerk, Mr. Lambert, on the telephone and I said, "I just got this pamphlet. Will you write the customary, regular, form letter that we send to every organization, and ask them to come in here." That letter went out. In a similar fashion, a letter was sent to your office—not because Sidney Hillman asked for it, or Joe Kamp, or anybody else asked for it, but because it was apparent to us you were engaging in a political

endeavor. And I assume that you are accused of a great many things you do not do, and I assure you, likewise, that this committee is accused of a great many things we do not do, and some members probably are accused of a bias which they may not possess.

Nonetheless, we are trying in an orderly fashion to go through the organizations and accord to the representatives of each of those organizations an opportunity to be heard, an opportunity to file a prepared statement, and an opportunity to file financial statements, in an orderly fashion. We will continue with that. Naturally, we seek the same information from the organizations that are engaged in political activities as rapidly as they come to us. And this pamphlet, which I do not recall having seen before, although it may have come to my office, if it does attack a candidate for a public office as it appears to do, would unquestionably come within the province of this committee.

Mr. SMITH. Of course, in there, I am tied in with the attacks on Senator Wheeler, Senator Nye, Senator Hoffman—

The CHAIRMAN. Congressman Hoffman.

Mr. SMITH. Congressman Hoffman, and numerous candidates for office.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, Mr. Gathings.

Mr. GATHINGS. I have no further questions at this time.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Smith, I note from reading the papers that at one time you were about to draft the distinguished Governor of Ohio as your running mate on your ticket. Is that right?

Mr. SMITH. When our convention met in Michigan, the Michigan party, it was necessary for us, as a convention in the State of Michigan, to present a ticket in order to get on the Michigan ballot before the dead line. So the State convention—not the national convention—chose as its choice for vice president Mr. John Bricker, because his name could have been printed on the ballot; because you cannot print, like you can in New York, where Mr. Roosevelt is running on the Liberal ticket, the Labor ticket, the Hillman ticket, the Browder ticket, and the Democratic ticket; you can only run on one ticket in Michigan. So we were going to leave the vice president blank and approve Mr. Bricker.

Mr. MURPHY. Now will you answer my question?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. My question was that you, at least your State group, did contemplate drafting or naming Mr. Bricker, the distinguished Governor of Ohio, as your running mate. Is not that right?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. And that was because your group believed that Mr. Bricker espouses and stands for and champions the same principles which you do. Is not that right?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, I do not think I would want to embrace all of that.

Mr. MURPHY. What difference would you state?

Mr. SMITH. He is very popular among nationalists in America.

Mr. MURPHY. Does he espouse the nationalist doctrine?

Mr. SMITH. The reason he was popular among—

Mr. MURPHY. Will you please answer my question: Does he espouse the nationalist doctrine?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know.

Mr. MURPHY. But you were willing to draft him as your running mate?

Mr. SMITH. I will answer your question, if you will let me, now.

Mr. MURPHY. All right. What is the reason?

Mr. SMITH. The reason he is popular among our people is because he made some very effective speeches against the superstate, international police force, and a world ticket.

Mr. MURPHY. Does he espouse the nationalist doctrine, the same as the distinguished gentleman from Montana, whom you said you would back, Senator Wheeler? I understood you to say you would back him?

Mr. SMITH. I would say he would be much less of a nationalist than Mr. Wheeler.

Mr. MURPHY. I will go back to that, but he does come closer to your doctrines than any of the other three persons—Mr. Dewey, Mr. Roosevelt, or Mr. Truman—does he?

Mr. SMITH. No. I think Mr. Truman is just as much of a nationalist as he is.

Mr. MURPHY. You do.

Mr. SMITH. Yes. In fact, we fought Wallace, and we were not so displeased over Truman's nomination.

Mr. MURPHY. Were not you interviewed in the Hotel Pennsylvania in New York the other day?

Mr. SMITH. Last Friday; yes.

Mr. MURPHY. And you gave a statement to the press on your position on Mr. Dewey, did you not?

Mr. SMITH. I interpreted our meeting in Buffalo.

Mr. MURPHY. What was your statement about Mr. Dewey?

Mr. SMITH. As best I can tell you, our 400 people in Buffalo decided that his up-State views, as between Dewey and Roosevelt, were favorable to Dewey.

Mr. MURPHY. In connection with that, I show you a copy of The Cross and the Flag, your August issue, and direct your attention to an open letter purporting to be signed by one Gerald L. K. Smith. You are the same gentleman, are you not, sir?

Mr. SMITH. I guess so.

Mr. MURPHY. I quote from that letter of yours in which you say that the distinguished Governor from New York referred to you and your followers as rodents. Did you write that letter?

Mr. SMITH. I did.

Mr. MURPHY. And you say you looked that up and find the dictionary definition was he referred to you as rats?

Mr. SMITH. Right.

Mr. MURPHY. Yet you back him?

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not back him.

Mr. MURPHY. Well, your supporters in New York back him?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; they do. I would like to say that they just recognize him as the lesser of two evils.

Mr. MURPHY. And they are going to back him, according to your statement?

Mr. SMITH. That word "back" is too strong——

Mr. MURPHY. Well, they are going to vote for him?

Mr. SMITH. I would say they are going to walk down and vote for him, if they vote.

Mr. MURPHY. You also say in that letter you were interviewed by one of the richest men in America. Who was that man?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I do not think I will answer that question.

Mr. MURPHY. Let me quote you: "I was called on by one of the richest men in America, who is very powerful in the Republican Party." Now will you please tell us who that man was?

Mr. SMITH. No; I won't tell you.

Mr. MURPHY. Why?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I just do not want to tell you.

Mr. MURPHY. Why?

Mr. SMITH. I am not going to give you an answer.

Mr. MURPHY. The only ground upon which you would be privileged not to answer would be that it might incriminate you, and certainly that is not the reason, is it? That is the only legal reason that you could find.

Mr. SMITH. I decline to answer that question. You can interpret my declination anyway you want to.

Mr. MURPHY. Then you are not relying on the law against self-incrimination, are you?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

Mr. MURPHY. Then you refuse to answer my question as to whom you referred to when you wrote the open letter concerning the political campaign, when you say you talked to one of the richest men in America, who is very powerful in the Republican Party—you refuse to answer that question, do you?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I refuse to answer.

Mr. MURPHY. That man did talk to you for over 2 hours, this "one of the richest men in America, powerful in the Republican Party," did he not?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

Mr. MURPHY. And he asked you, did he not, and he stated to you, did he not, this one of the richest men in America, powerful in the Republican Party, "You can have anything you want if you will go along now with the Republican Party and with Tom Dewey"? Is not that what he said to you?

Mr. SMITH. Any capacity.

Mr. MURPHY. Will you tell us who it was who said to you "You can have anything you want"? We are investigating campaign expenditures, and will you please tell us who it was who said to you that you could have anything you want if you will go along with the party and Tom Dewey?

Mr. SMITH. No; I am not going to answer you.

Mr. MURPHY. You do agree that is a pertinent question?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; very pertinent—pertinent to the political issues. If I can stay out of jail, I am going to tell that where it will do the most good.

Mr. MURPHY. I have no notion of that; all I am trying to find out is, did he offer you money?

Mr. SMITH. No; he did not offer me money.

Mr. MURPHY. He said you could have anything you wanted. Will you indicate what that meant?

Mr. SMITH. I was able to turn down the spending power, with seven men, of over \$200,000,000 worth of New Deal patronage, through—

Mr. MURPHY. Please answer my question: What did he indicate he

meant when he said, "You can have anything you want if you will go along now with the party and with Tom Dewey"?

Mr. SMITH. Well, Mr. Dewey's good will.

Mr. MURPHY. In effect you are going along with Tom Dewey, are you not?

Mr. SMITH. I am not.

Mr. MURPHY. But your followers are, in Ohio and New York, are they not?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, in a half-hearted way.

Mr. MURPHY. Are you receiving anything for that from this gentleman?

Mr. SMITH. Absolutely not; absolutely not.

Mr. MURPHY. You also said in your letter, "I also came away from that conference with the conviction"——

Mr. SMITH. Just a comment on that, Mr. Chairman. I will answer your question more completely, too.

Mr. MURPHY. Which one—the first one?

Mr. SMITH. I will just comment and you will see. If it can be established now or any time within 10 years from now that I have received any money from the Republican Party in connection with this campaign, prior to the convention or since the campaign, accept my statement as a confession of guilt, of perjury, and you can brand me as a perjurer any time in the next 10 years.

Mr. MURPHY. But in your letter to the Nation, it is called an open letter, and in that you said this man said to you, "You can have anything you want if you will go along with the party and with Tom Dewey." Why don't you tell us who that person was, so that we can find out what the facts are?

Mr. SMITH. No, I do not think I want to.

Mr. MURPHY. All right; you refuse?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. You also say, "I also came away from that conference with the conviction that Dewey belongs to Winston Churchill body and soul." Do you mean that?

Mr. SMITH. Well, it still sounds pretty good to me.

Mr. MURPHY. And your answer to that is, you believe he does?

Mr. SMITH. I will tell you why; because when he went to Mackinac Island, he said, before the Mackinac conference, he favored a permanent alliance with Great Britain. This man in the conference said, "You ought to forget this nationalist stuff. We are going to be fighting Russia with Germany on our side, anyway. We assume that Britain will follow." I said, "You mean a permanent alliance?" "Yes." I said, "How does Dewey feel?" "He feels the same way." Then I said, "Oh, you want me to do—all that Benedict Arnold did war to deliver a few soldiers at West Point to the British; now you want me"——

Mr. MURPHY. If you are talking about things like that, which are important in the state of the Nation, do not you think we are entitled to the name, now?

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not think so. Wait until the campaign is all over, when we are all patriots——

Mr. MURPHY. I quote further from your letter on page 423:

The next day when the convention started, practically every delegate I talked with, knew, or talked to, favored Governor Bricker, because they believed he was a nationalist.

Did you mean that?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, I meant that; but I did not say he was as much of a nationalist as Wheeler.

Mr. MURPHY. You said he was a nationalist, when you said that in your open letter.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, I think he is a nationalist.

Mr. MURPHY. You also state in your letter:

Those of us who had watched this thing from the beginning knew it had been bought from the inside for Dewey, exactly the same way and by the same people who bought it from the inside for Willkie in 1940.

That was true, was it not?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; that is still good stuff.

Mr. MURPHY. I also notice in your magazine and from the same issue, on page 420, a quotation from the Chicago Tribune:

Now he has finished the pilgrimage to Downing Street by way of Wall Street. He has bought and been bought by the prospect of millions for his campaign fund from New York bankers; yet he has lost millions of votes of New York Republicans as surely as he has lost voters in some other of the American States. They now have no recourse but to repudiate him as a deserter.

You put that in your magazine, did you not?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. MURPHY. Who is the Chicago Tribune backing now? Are they backing Mr. Dewey?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I would say they are supporting him with a fine spray of ice water.

Mr. MURPHY. But you agree with the Chicago Tribune when they say this?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; that suits me. I have no recollection, but everything you find in the magazine from the front cover to the last, I stand for.

Mr. MURPHY. Do you agree with the Chicago Tribune that now they have no recourse but to repudiate him as a deserter? Do you agree with that?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; that sounds like good stuff to me.

Mr. MURPHY. Yet you are backing him in Ohio and New York?

Mr. SMITH. No; I am just choosing between a thug and a bank robber.

Mr. MURPHY. And you refer to the President of the United States, in time of war—

Mr. SMITH. No; I used a figure. Do not try to develop that; I just used a figure.

Mr. MURPHY. Well, who was the thug and who was the bank robber?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know; I just—

Mr. MURPHY. You say you prefer the alternative. What was the alternative?

Mr. SMITH. Suppose I asked you whether you would rather be stopped by a pickpocket or a hold-up man. You would say, "Well, I would rather have the pickpocket, because he might not have a gun." According to your cross-examination, you would then make folks believe you favor the pickpocket, because the thug might poke a gun in your stomach.

Mr. MURPHY. Then you do not think the President of the United States is either a thug or a bank robber?



Mr. SMITH. Oh, no. I would not speak critically of the President of the United States!

Mr. MURPHY. Then I would like to go further into this question of the Cross and the Flag. You say that started in April 1942. And in your first issue you stated, did you not, "While we are being rationed on sugar, our sugar is being sent to Russia"? You said that, did you not?

The CHAIRMAN. I covered that earlier.

Mr. MURPHY. I beg your pardon. I do not want to repeat. I withdraw the question and ask that it be stricken out.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, could I file with the committee an article which appears in Reader's Digest for this month? It is an article entitled, "The New Communist Conspiracy."

Mr. MURPHY. For what purpose do you file it?

Mr. SMITH. To prove that the Communists in America are using the war emergency to develop a Communist state here.

Mr. MURPHY. Do you also oppose people who support Germany?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. MURPHY. What do you think ought to be done with Hitler? You speak of war criminals, here in your platform; there is nothing in there about Hitler.

Mr. SMITH. Oh, yes; there is.

Mr. MURPHY. I show you your platform on page 3. Will you point out anything in that platform there about Germany?

Mr. SMITH. I do not name Stalin or Churchill or anybody else. I deal with fascism, imperialism, and communism. Those are the three evils of the world.

Mr. MURPHY. What do you think ought to be done with Hitler? Would you express an opinion on that?

Mr. SMITH. Turn him over to the discretion of General Marshall.

Mr. MURPHY. I also note in your platform, page 3, "Bring the boys home as soon as the war ends." What other distinguished American said the same thing; do you know?

Mr. SMITH. Do you mean to imply I am a distinguished American, Congressman?

Mr. MURPHY. You are the leader of a party, sir. I want to treat you with all the respect in the world. I do not want to give any offense. I am only doing my job.

Mr. SMITH. I appreciate the honor.

Mr. MURPHY. You do recall hearing that over the radio, do you not—"Bring the boys home as soon as the war ends"? And I do not want to be misunderstood. We have a problem on shipping; we have a problem of the war in Japan; we have the problem of policing Germany, but your statement is, "Bring the boys home as soon as the war ends," and one other distinguished American said exactly the same thing. Do you agree with him?

Mr. SMITH. I agree with anybody that said that, even Roosevelt. Did not he say it, and he said they had already started?

Mr. MURPHY. He said they had a demobilization plan, but another distinguished American said, "Bring the boys home as soon as the war ends."

Mr. SMITH. Well, that is good doctrine.

Mr. MURPHY. I notice also in your platform, "Stop the war as soon as our adversaries will agree to a peace based on American objectives." Do you believe in the policy of unconditional surrender?

Mr. SMITH. That does not embrace the problem of unconditional surrender. Our objective is to win the war.

Mr. MURPHY. Do you believe in the policy of unconditional surrender?

Mr. SMITH. It is according to how it is interpreted. If interpreted by Mr. Hull, yes; but if interpreted by Mr. Morgenthau, no.

Mr. MURPHY. At any rate, you believe in unconditional surrender for Germany, do you not?

Mr. SMITH. There is only one way to win a war, that is to win it.

Mr. MURPHY. You do not agree with him on world security?

Mr. SMITH. No.

Mr. MURPHY. You oppose that?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Or your platform does?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. You also agree there should be an annual income for workers, do you not?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. MURPHY. You do agree, sir?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. And the C. I. O. agree on that, do they not—Mr. Philip Murray?

Mr. SMITH. If they do, I agree with them. I agree with them on several things. I agree with them on their recent convention in Michigan, where they voted to rule all Communists out of the organization in Michigan. I think that is the result of some of our good work over there.

Mr. MURPHY. I am glad to hear it; I am all for that.

You also stated—and this part is important, but maybe a little more important than the other—when you spoke of Mr. Dewey, do I understand he invited you publicly, or do you mean that there was some sort of a private meeting between you and Mr. Dewey?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, no.

Mr. MURPHY. For a private meeting?

Mr. SMITH. The thing that prompted the question should be discussed and I am only too happy to discuss it.

Mr. MURPHY. If you will excuse me just a moment—

Mr. SMITH. There is no disposition on my part—

Mr. MURPHY (continuing). I want to get it exact so we will have no misunderstanding as to the facts.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. You said in a public statement Dewey had not been complimentary. What about private statements?

Mr. SMITH. He has never been complimentary in private statements, to my knowledge, but there is a strategy, today there is a strategy with the Republican Party that would like to excoriate our support in public and then recruit our support in private, and in forming this new party I had hoped to challenge the Republican Party by starting this new party, but I am not going to support anybody who does his work in that manner.

Mr. MURPHY. With reference to these sales: Have you sold any of your books in bulk?

Mr. SMITH. What book?

Mr. MURPHY. The Cross and the Flag.

Mr. SMITH. No; I accept no bulk orders.

Mr. MURPHY. It is sold for 25 cents a copy or \$2 a year?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

Mr. MURPHY. How many copies would you say you sold a month?

Mr. SMITH. You mean besides subscriptions?

Mr. MURPHY. No; include them.

Mr. SMITH. Oh, it runs between the—the subscriptions are not large; it runs between twelve and twenty thousand.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not a fact that your daily income receipts are about, between \$600 and \$800 a day?

Mr. SMITH. No; I would not say that.

Mr. MURPHY. Does not your books show that now in Detroit?

Mr. SMITH. No; I would not say that. I would say that—I would say that in the campaign—I said this morning that we had spent something like \$5,000—didn't I say that this morning—on the campaign?

Mr. MURPHY. Apart from that have not your books shown since September a daily average of between \$600 and \$800 from sales, or from all sources, and on your books, referring to the Cross and the Flag?

Mr. SMITH. No; I would not say it would run that much; it would run not over a third that much, including my campaign costs.

Mr. MURPHY. Now you have two organizations, do you not, the America First Party and then a committee of some 1,000,000?

Mr. SMITH. No.

Mr. MURPHY. A committee of about 1,000,000?

Mr. SMITH. The committee of a million went out of existence.

Mr. MURPHY. It has no income?

Mr. SMITH. No; it did not handle any funds.

Mr. MURPHY. You had no income—it had no income this last year?

Mr. SMITH. No.

Mr. MURPHY. Nothing at all?

Mr. SMITH. No.

Mr. MURPHY. All right. How many employees do you have in connection with the magazine, in the publication venture?

Mr. SMITH. We have the equivalent of about, according to what our obligations are, from about 6 to 9.

Mr. MURPHY. Does Evelyn Miller work for you?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Ross Brady?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Irene Benson?

Mr. SMITH. Benzi.

Mr. MURPHY. Badoman.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not true that you had \$3,180, on the first day of the convention, brought to your office by Dorman including two \$500 bills, nine \$100 bills, and the rest in bills of \$20 or less?

Mr. SMITH. No; it is not.

Mr. MURPHY. You deny that; you deny that?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, I do.

Mr. MURPHY. You were asked about ghost writers, and I suppose you have read about certain other ghost writers. Have you heard of governors' speeches?

Mr. SMITH. Governors?

Mr. MURPHY. You were talking about ghost writers and I understood you to say ghost writers wrote Roosevelt's speeches. You are against the policy of ghost writers, I take it?

Mr. SMITH. If a man cannot write a speech and has got to make one I take it he would get someone else to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You think that the President of the United States is not able to write his own speeches?

Mr. SMITH. No, I would not say that; I would say that he can. I think Mr. Roosevelt could make and does make and can make a very brilliant speech all by himself but that a good many of them come from aides.

Mr. MURPHY. You named only one. Do you have any information that Judge Roseman wrote all the President's speeches?

Mr. SMITH. No. I would say that he has a habit of getting others to help write them.

Mr. MURPHY. And before I ask you this question: I believe one question was asked you by the chairman as to who this gentleman from Chicago was who invited this man Maertz and you said you did not know. How do you know it was a man from Chicago who invited him?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I do not know; I just assumed that since this man Maertz lived in Chicago and he brought a card, I assumed that he probably got it from somebody out there. I cannot even—

Mr. MURPHY. You made the assertion under oath that it was a man from Chicago who invited him; on that kind of evidence?

Mr. SMITH. No; I could have—

Mr. MURPHY. But you did.

Mr. SMITH. Well, what did I say?

Mr. MURPHY. You said that a man from Chicago invited Maertz.

Mr. SMITH. Well, I presume I should have said that I assumed a man from Chicago invited him, because as a matter of fact, I do not know who invited him, but—it might have been someone from Philadelphia or New York.

Mr. MURPHY. This man Burgas you had a conference with as head of the F. B. I.—how do you spell his name?

Mr. SMITH. B-u-r-g-a-s.

Mr. MURPHY. At any rate, the man you talked to you gave the name of this man Buzzi?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. How long did he remain with the F. B. I. after you talked to him?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know, I guess about a year.

Mr. MURPHY. Was not he employed by somebody else soon after that?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Who?

Mr. SMITH. The Ford Motor Co.

Mr. MURPHY. The Ford Motor Co.?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. He had been with the F. B. I.

Mr. MURPHY. I am not trying to make a case against him.

Mr. SMITH. I understand.

Mr. MURPHY. I just wanted to establish his connection.

Mr. SMITH. I know this has no political motive; we realize that.

Mr. MURPHY. I think I have about covered everything.

Now, may I make a request that has been made of everyone: Will you produce for the committee the receipts and expenditures from January 1, 1944, down to and including November 7, 1944, together with a copy of your publications, together with the scripts of your radio addresses, that might have been prepared by your organization?

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask you a question.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. I want to do what is lawful and what is required by law. Is that required by law?

Mr. MURPHY. This committee has the right to make an investigation of all the activities in connection with this campaign and in pursuance of that investigation would have the perfect, legal right, to ask that of you, and we have asked it of everybody who has come before this committee; there is no distinction as to that.

Mr. SMITH. I am aware of that. The reason I asked you that question is because we are not a big organization and even though it did require an extra corp- we would not object to that if we can reach out in the city of Detroit and bring in an abundance of extra help.

Mr. MURPHY. But I do not want to make it hard on you. All I want is your receipts and expenditures.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. And a copy of the transcripts of the radio speeches; you would have all those.

Mr. SMITH. No; you mean talks?

Mr. MURPHY. Well, you have copies, I take it, made of your radio scripts.

Mr. SMITH. We will endeavor to furnish that information.

The CHAIRMAN. I desire to go back to this letter that Mr. Murphy was reading from in which he referred to the comment that Governor Dewey is supposed to have made in which he referred to the American Firsters as "rodents." And you make this statement:

In my interview with the press I revealed that Governor Dewey's mother had even attended my last meeting at Owosso, Mich., and seemed to enjoy it. A few days later, Mrs. Dewey was interviewed and when questioned concerning me, she said: "Why that man Gerald L. K. Smith should be in jail."

Now, do you know a man named George Maines, who lives at Flint, Mich.?

Mr. SMITH. Maines.

The CHAIRMAN. Maines?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I am sorry. Did she attend the Owosso meeting with Mr. Maines?

Mr. SMITH. He went and got her.

The CHAIRMAN. He went and got her and brought her to the meeting?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.



**INDEX**

**WITNESSES**

Gerald L. K. Smith, director, America First Party

Page  
315

**SUBJECT MATTER**

Testimony of Gerald L. K. Smith

315

- I





# INDEX

---

## WITNESS

Gerald L. K. Smith, director, America First Party-----	Page 315
--	-------------

## SUBJECT MATTERS

Testimony of Gerald L. K. Smith-----	315
--------------------------------------	-----